

METHODIST REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1895.

ART. I.—NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL.

THAT the natural is or is not all-embracing is one of the perennial contentions. It is also one in which partisan spirit has to an unusual degree taken the place of thought and logical obligation. It is plain that this question cannot be profitably discussed without some definite conception of what we mean by nature and the natural; but in place of definition we have all too often only mutual belaboring on the part of the respective champions. In popular thought the notion of nature is supposed to be perfectly clear; whereas, in fact, it is in the highest degree obscure and uncertain. It is this fictitious clearness and real obscurity which explain the desultory and sterile character of the debate concerning the range and realm of the natural.

And yet this antithesis of natural and supernatural is one of the most important in our thought. It contains the reason of the opposition of science and religion, so far as that opposition has an intellectual root. Whoever will reflect upon the arguments on this subject will see that they all depend upon a certain conception of the natural. Evolution would never conflict with religion but for a peculiar conception of the natural. No one would ever have dreamed of a conflict between science and religion but for a particular conception of the natural. In history, also, all alleged supernatural occurrences are to be looked upon either as fictions or as misunderstood natural events. A natural interpretation is demanded, and this is held to exclude the supernatural. Thus the natural and the super-

natural are set up as mutually exclusive, and in the name of this opposition a deal of unprofitable, and some mischievous, talking is done. It is worth while, therefore, to attempt to clear up the problem, not so much with the aim of solving as of understanding it. In any case, we cannot hope to solve it unless we first understand it. Nature and natural have, of course, a great variety of meanings; but in this discussion they will be limited by their antithesis, the supernatural.

When we are seeking to define the natural a first thought is to limit it to the world of matter, leaving spirit and the spiritual as something apart. But the natural, as the antithesis of the supernatural, is by no means confined to the physical realm. The reign of law is soon discovered in the inner world, and thus, gradually, the spiritual also is drawn into the sphere of the natural. Mental movements, as well as physical changes, arise naturally. Certain fixed ways of grouping and happening are found in the inner world as well as in the outer. Life, mind, society, all human activity and progress, are said to be subject to laws as fixed as those of the planets. They may be more complex and less easily discerned, but they are as absolute and unyielding as the law of gravitation. When this announcement is made with due emphasis and proper rhetorical embellishment it never fails to produce a sensation. If the untrained bystander chance to be antireligious in his disposition he hastens to conclude that certainly religion, and probably God, must go. If he be religious in his tendencies he begins to look about somewhat anxiously for breaks in the "iron chain" and queries whether science be not the true antichrist. If he be one of the clergy the performance varies according to the ecclesiastical type; but, in any case, "science falsely so called" comes in for sundry disparaging remarks.

The grounds of this flurry are not far to seek. First, an order of law is discovered, and this is forthwith transformed into necessity. This is next connected with the crude metaphysics of uncritical thought, and nature is at once erected into a mechanical and self-sufficing system, and its laws are made self-executing necessities. The movement is completed when finally nature is hypostasized as a cause and, under the form of "Nature," appears as a very able cosmic manager. By this time the speculator is prepared to maintain natural causation against

supernatural, and continuity and uniformity against miraculous break and irruption. If there be any supernatural, which is increasingly doubtful, it is deistically conceived as something perhaps necessary to set the system agoing, but, at present, without any assignable function. And if the supernatural should manifest itself in the system it could be only by violence and arbitrary irruption. Every practiced reader is familiar with this line of thought.

Now, that in all this the speculator is under the unsuspected influence of all the idols, both of the tribe and of the den, is manifest upon a little reflection. Two things quite distinct are confused: first, the observed order, and, second, its cause. That observation reveals only the order of coexistence and sequence, and does not extend to causation, is a commonplace of modern philosophy. The order of being and happening must be learned from experience. The nature of the cause or causes is a problem of speculation. The inductive problem might be solved without touching the speculative; and there might be complete agreement in the report of observation, with the widest divergency in the speculative explanation. But the crude speculator never masters this distinction, and oscillates confusedly between nature as an observed order and nature as a system of necessary, generally material, causation. There can be no progress in this discussion until these questions are sharply and finally distinguished. Matter, as a general name for the bodies about us, is an undeniable fact; but matter as cause is a very obscure notion, and, indeed, it may well be doubted if there is any such thing. Nature, likewise, as the observed order of things and events, is a perfectly clear conception; but "Nature" as cause, as self-administering system, is a piece of more than doubtful metaphysics.

And now, possibly, we shall best work our way into the subject by attempting to define a natural event. It is a somewhat roundabout way; but we shall thus best get an insight into the metaphysics implicit in the current view.

As a matter of experience we find that things and events are connected with other things and events in certain ways. There is an order discernible in their happening and their mutual relations. Such an order we call a law. Among these laws themselves we find a higher order, which unites them into a system.

Thus, we are led to think of a system of law which embraces all events and prescribes to each its nature and position in the whole. Events thus connected by law with other events, so that they are not something anomalous and discontinuous, but cases of a kind or exemplifications of a rule, we call natural. The system which embraces all things and events we may call nature. In so doing, however, we must recognize that this conception of nature transcends experience. Nature is not given as a systematic whole; only the natural event is given, that is, the event which is connected by rule with other events. Let us keep, then, to the natural event, and postpone the consideration of "Nature."

Of course, this view of a natural event does not imply a rigid monotony of events. The continuity of natural law is compatible with great phenomenal discontinuity. We often have apparent departures from the apparent order; but, on closer inspection, it is found that the essential order of law is maintained, even in its seeming infraction. Thus, an earthquake may be a departure from the accustomed immobility of the earth's crust; but it is, nevertheless, the outcome of the familiar laws of physics. Thus, again, the freezing of water in a flame seems like a contradiction of natural law; and yet the laws of physics are not violated, but rather illustrated by this fact. And so we easily come to believe that all events are bound up in an order of law, and that if we knew all we should find even the most anomalous events falling into line. Having once mastered this distinction between essential continuity and phenomenal discontinuity, we become somewhat tolerant, even of apparently miraculous stories; only nothing of the supernatural must be allowed in them. Cures, at shrines or by means of relics or holy water or by formulas of blessing or exorcism, become quite credible if we may view them as cases of the influence of the mind on the body. Even witches, who have long been under the ban, are becoming a fairly intelligible folk since the development of hypnotism.

A natural event, then, is one which is comprised in an order of law and is explained by it. It is easy to agree with the first part of this definition. It affirms simply an order of coexistence and sequence among things and events, and says nothing about their causation or dynamic connection. On this view

we might even regard nature as only the orderly form under which a divine purpose is being continuously realized by a continuous divine activity. But the second part of the definition contains a trace of metaphysics. The natural event is said to be explained by the order of law. Much depends, therefore, on the meaning of explanation.

Explanation is of several forms. An event is said to be explained when it is seen to be a case of a kind, or when it is seen to be an implication of the laws which concur in its origination, or when it is referred to its efficient cause, or when it is related to a purpose. In the first case we merely classify the event and say nothing of causation. In the second case we connect the event with other events; but we still leave the problem of causation untouched. In the third form our thought is metaphysical; and in the fourth form it is teleological. In which of these senses is the natural event explained by the order of law? Criticism would show that it is only in the first two senses that we have a natural explanation. What lies beyond these is metaphysics and teleology. But our spontaneous dogmatism, when brightened up by a little not very profound reflection, will insist that a natural event is causally or dynamically explained by its antecedents. Nature is not only a phenomenal order, but a dynamic system which, for the present, at least, works itself out according to the law of the conservation of energy, neither losing anything to an extranatural region nor suffering any irruption from without. And within this system the antecedents causally explain the consequents. This constitutes it natural.

This view seems almost self-evident, as it has our native sense-dogmatism and, apparently, the law of causation also in its favor. The former element is shown in its baselessness by criticism, and the appeal to the law of causation identifies the general principle of causation with a particular conception of it. But the general conviction that events must have a cause does not decide the nature or location of the cause. The causation need not be in the series of events at all, but may rather lie in something which is distinct from any or all of them. A series of thoughts has no dynamic relations among the thoughts composing it, although they may succeed one another according to law. The proper causality, however, is not to be found in the thoughts

themselves, but rather in the one mind which is not the thoughts, but rather their common source and bond. It is possible that this conception applies to the causation of all phenomena. Whatever Hume may have done with causation in general, he certainly succeeded in making physical causation a very questionable conception.

But the conception of nature, as a system of mechanical and unpurposed causation, still dominates uncritical thought. We cannot, indeed, follow the order of natural causation by any continuous logical movement. We are not able to trace the antecedents into the consequents, or to find the consequents in the antecedents, or to see that both antecedent and consequent are but successive phases of one fact. The junctions and transitions of nature are all opaque to our intelligence. We see one fact following another fact, but we do not see that it is the result of the previous fact. For all we know *A* is not the cause of *B*; but both *A* and *B* are implications of a law or products of a cause deeper than both. In passing from one phenomenon to another, thought moves along no continuously welded line, but rather over a corduroy road, with all the accompaniments of bumping and jolting. But what we do not know we may well believe; and, hence, we may safely assume that natural causation is continuous and all-embracing. That it is actual is a matter of course for spontaneous thought.

Our logical inability to reach such continuity and the ease with which it may be assumed are well illustrated in parts of Mr. Spencer's philosophy. In his very natural desire to bring his system into line with physical science he defines evolution as an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, etc. In this definition matter and motion are the only recognized factors; and the redistribution of matter and motion becomes the comprehensive formula for the cosmic problem. But Mr. Spencer also has an unknowable, inscrutable force in his system as its foundation; and some way must be found of uniting it with the physical formula. This is done by declaring that matter and motion are phases, or aspects, or manifestations of the unknowable force, and by pointing out that the indestructibility of matter and the continuity of motion at last reduce to affirmations of the persistence of force. This doctrine is the deepest of all and includes all. We may, then,

pro-
tion
in l
whic
T
silen
busi
inve
the m
the c
persi
mani
its p
able
moti
matt
argu
varia
our s
natur
natur
more
posse
all we
by som
exten
ness r
tinnity
We
contin
the dis
ally ag
but thi
planati
in earl
and am
otherw
becom
tion of
that it

proceed to redistribute matter and motion, in the sure conviction that the continuity of this order will never fail us. But, in his view, it is precisely this continuity which is doubtful, or which, at best, is a matter of pure assumption.

The unknowable, we said, is a silent partner in the concern; silent, because only matter and motion appear in conducting the business; and yet a partner, if not the entire firm, because on investigation these active partners turn out to be only masks of the unknowable itself. And then a question arises concerning the constancy of these manifestations. The argument from the persistence of force, such as it is, only shows that the force manifested must not perish, but not that it must always retain its present form. There is nothing to show that the unknowable must always manifest itself in just so much matter and motion, neither more nor less, or that it must manifest itself in matter and motion at all. It is, then, possible, so far as the argument goes, that the material manifestation should be a variable one, and should even cease altogether. In that case our speculator, who abhors the notion of breaks and faults in nature, would be as badly off as the most exaggerated supernaturalism could possibly make him. Without very much more information concerning the unknowable than we actually possess no one can afford to be responsible for its doings. For all we can say the natural order may at any time be modified by some new reaction of this nonphenomenal power; to what extent is beyond all calculation. But our logical defenselessness may easily be covered up by a few flourishes about continuity, or words to that effect.

We have another illustration of the same desire for natural continuity and of the ease with which it is reached by faith in the discussion concerning the origin of life. It is pretty generally agreed that spontaneous generation does not occur nowadays; but this by no means prohibits us from believing in a natural explanation. The extraordinary physical conditions of the earth in early times may well lead us to expect extraordinary results; and among them might be "the momentary revelation of an otherwise latent law." The more we think of it the clearer it becomes; and, especially, the more we reflect upon that abomination of desolation, a miracle, the stronger grows our conviction that it must have been so. Such an event would be, indeed, a

phenomenal miracle; for "the momentary revelation of an otherwise latent law" is indistinguishable from the occurrence of a single extraordinary event, and a veritable miracle could hardly appear as other than a unique and lonely event. Still, such an occurrence would not be a real miracle, as it would have its ground in nature, and not in any extranatural source. How a momentary revelation, which is never repeated, can be called a law is also a point of some difficulty. Of course, we refer to the extraordinary conditions; but, as life itself is not compatible with conditions which vary widely from those existing, we have to be a little cautious in emphasizing the peculiarity of the conditions. In fact, all that we get from our natural explanation is not any positive insight, but simply a denial of any extranatural agency. With this we are enabled to believe in a continuity which we cannot trace or to affirm a continuity which we cannot demonstrate.

We reach a similar result in our fear of admitting the supernatural in the spiritual life. Our knowledge of mental laws is very vague and superficial at best; but there is nothing to prevent our assuming that, if we knew all the antecedents, the physical and social environment also, and the personal equation as well, we could trace the rise of every thought and emotion as a perfectly natural event. Genius, special gifts, peculiar insight may, indeed, be allowed, as it would be a sorry performance to reduce men to a dead level; but all of these things must be referred to a natural origin. Only on this condition can we dwell in mental peace. A natural origin means an origin within nature; and nature is vaguely conceived of as a necessary system, which contains its causation in itself and blindly unfolds its implications. That any such nature exists is known, of course, by hypothesis.

But, now, it may be urged that the existence of such a nature is a postulate of science and, therefore, is not to be denied. This is a claim so often made that it has acquired weight by sheer repetition. The desire for totality, also, is so strong that the uncritical mind is sure to find such a claim plausible. But science is only one of human interests, and, like all the others, it must consent to see its claims discounted by reality. For science as a study of the practical uniformities of experience, with "a reasonable degree of extension to adjacent cases,"

nothing is needed but the practical continuity of phenomenal law. For science as absolute knowledge, or as absolute system comprehending all things in a spatial and temporal order and rigidly deducing every consequent from its antecedents, thus binding all things together by an iron chain of necessity, etc., the assumption in question may well be a "postulate;" but whether we are to grant the postulate remains an open question. There is something humorous in supposing a thing real because it is postulated. And this absolute science itself is really only an idol of the den, a figment of the system-building fancy. It is due, partly, to the unchastened desire for totality and finished system, and, partly, to mistaking one aspect of life and experience for the whole. Possibly, even physical reality has some more practical and important function than simply to fulfill the calculations of the theorist. As a matter of fact, it is not a bad servant and minister of intelligence, and it makes a very fair stage for the development of life and history. Such a conception of its functions is quite as consonant with the indications of experience as the "postulate" of absolute science.

The practical importance of these theoretical threats provided the postulate is not granted may be estimated by considering the relation of human will and purpose to physical nature. Here is a field where physical events are constantly happening, without being deducible from their physical antecedents. Here, our will counts for a cause of changes, so that the physical system is constantly taking on forms which, left to itself, it would not have assumed. Very considerable features of that system are to be traced, not to the nebula, but to human will and purpose, which have impressed themselves upon the system. Once in a while, a speculator gets so confused with "science" and its "postulates" and with his dream of a system that he denies all this and leaves us to infer that his own thought counts for nothing in his physical movements, not even in his denial. The plexuses, the ganglia, the nascent motor excitations, and, in particular, the conservation of energy, judiciously misunderstood, have all wrought together and done whatever we have attributed to him, yet without any intervention of his thought whatever, and, indeed, so far as we know, without its existence. Such cases, of course, are pathologic; they only serve to show what mental blindness and confusion may be wrought by a

romantic devotion to theoretical abstractions. But if we are to escape the pathology we must recognize that our will counts for something in the course of physical events—a conclusion, indeed, very obnoxious to dealers in absolute “postulates,” but not so farfetched to a student of practical life, at least to one who has not been, as Berkeley would say, “debauched by speculation.”

There is no occasion, then, to be disturbed over the *ultimatum*—either absolute continuity or no science. Such intimations are formidable only in the closet, and have influence mainly in the den. A set of sprites cognizant of physical phenomena, but not of human personality, might set themselves to study the physics of bodily movement. They might discover a great many uniformities in which all might agree; but if they should proceed to lay it down as an absolute postulate that every physical movement must be rigorously deduced from an antecedent movement, and especially that no extraphysical influence of a volitional nature was to be allowed, under penalty of exploding science, we should think that they had got hold of the writings of some of our romantic continuity theorists and dealers in absolute science.

But, whatever freedom we allow our hypothetical sprites, it is high time we saw through these fictions of abstract theory. If we allow that human wills or other wills are playing into nature there is still a great realm of discoverable phenomenal uniformity which is the fruitful field of practical science. This remains, whatever our theory of cosmic causation. Even if we suppose that it is freedom which acts through the law, the law remains and a knowledge of it is practically as valuable as ever. Freedom in nature cancels no law of physics. Freedom in willing cancels no law of mind. The claim that the realm of law would go if we admitted that our volition has anything to do with our voluntary movements is not speech, but mere ejaculation. It is the outcome of a scientific prudery which understands neither itself nor its problem.

It is a long while since we set out to find what we mean by a natural event. After a deal of casting about it would seem that all we can agree upon is this: a natural event is one which occurs in an order of law. In this sense even the influence of the human will in the physical world is natural. It is not, in-

deed, something which the physical system produces of itself; but in the total order of life it is a familiar fact. It is, also, highly obscure and mysterious in its causation; but, as a fact of constant occurrence under certain conditions, it is natural. The sequence of other events may be equally mysterious as to its causality, and we may be equally unable to connect antecedent and consequent by any logical or dynamic bond; but when we are able to trace an order of law in the happening we call it natural. When we pass beyond this conception of the natural and erect nature into a blind and necessary system we plunge into metaphysics, and naturalism becomes little more than the crude dogmatism of the senses.

This conception of the natural, it will be noticed, says nothing about causation. It simply claims that events are connected in an order, and that when we analyze an event we find it connected with other events according to fixed rules. When the rules prove to be well-known ones we have a familiar event, or one of a familiar class. When the event cannot be classed under known laws we still believe that there are laws under which it might be classed if we knew them. Pushing this thought to the limit, we come again upon the thought that all events are natural, or that all are bound up in a system of law which prescribes to each its place and the mode of its occurrence. Thus, once more the natural becomes all-embracing, and leaves no place for the supernatural.

In this suggestion our thought passes from the natural event to "Nature" as a system and ground of events. In this it is led on, partly, by metaphysical considerations and, partly, by the desire for totality or systematic completeness. Neither of these grounds, however, is clearly conceived in spontaneous thought. Metaphysical continuity there must be somewhere; but whether it is to be in the system itself, conceived as something substantial, or rather in the ontological cause and ground of the system, does not at once appear. In assuming the substantiality and causal continuity of nature the mind confounds the general demand for metaphysical continuity with a particular and doubtful conception thereof. It might turn out that the continuity of the system is not one of stuff or substance, but one of law and plan, so that all things and events, new and old alike, are subject to the one order of law, just as the

continuity of a web does not consist in having only the same threads, but in weaving all threads according to the common pattern. All events may well be comprised in an order of law; but it is not decided whether this order is a self-sufficient, opaque necessity, or whether it is simply an abstraction from the observed facts of coexistence and sequence. In the subjection of physical forces to our service certain fixed orders are followed, but, nevertheless, our purposes are wrought out. Again, things and events may form parts of a connected and systematic whole; but it is altogether possible that that whole is a plan, and not an opaque necessity. Doubtless if we knew all everything would be explained; but before we can make any use of this conviction we must inquire what the "all" is we should need to know and in what sense explanation is taken. If we make the "all" large enough even miracles themselves would be explained—that is, we might find for them a sufficient cause and a sufficient reason.

But this paper is growing long, and we are not getting on. About the only thing clear thus far is that the question is a perfect thicket of metaphysics. In lack of both time and space to argue out the matter we content ourselves with indicating the direction in which we conceive the truth to lie.

First, we must distinguish the scientific from the metaphysical question. The fruitful field of science lies in the study of the uniformities of coexistence and sequence revealed in experience and in seeking to connect things and events in accordance therewith. There are regular ways of being and happening in the physical, mental, and social worlds; and a knowledge of these ways is of the utmost practical value. In this sense law may well be universal. But these uniformities do not touch the question of freedom and purpose at all. The laws of physics are fixed; and this very fact fits them to be our servant. The laws of mind are equally fixed; but freedom works through them.

Next, the metaphysical question. This is something quite distinct. Popular metaphysics is built up almost entirely around the notion of matter, conceived as a lump. This is the central conception, and this is the antithesis of intelligence. The conception of nature is built on the same model and largely with the same material. Thus, nature is looked upon as the antithe-

sis of mind, and to call a thing natural is to deny all relation to intelligence. When, then, the universality of law is affirmed it is at once identified with the universality of blind mechanical causation, and then we wail or triumph according to our disposition. But when the critic comes and searches out this mode of thinking its superficiality is quickly seen. It is really the apotheosis of sense-thinking.

But if it should turn out that the cause behind the law is essentially personal and purposive, and that the system of law represents only the general form of this free causality, there would be no difficulty in holding that events in general are, at once, natural in the mode of their occurrence and supernatural in their causation. The natural would be the mode of manifestation of the supernatural, and the supernatural would be the real ground and administrator of the natural. In that case we should not have the antithesis of two mutually exclusive realms, but rather that of ground and manifestation, or of agent and mode of working. The supernatural would not be something of a scenic and arbitrary character apart from nature, but rather a supreme will and reason in nature, realizing its purposes through nature. And to this conception of the relation of the natural to the supernatural metaphysics is surely bringing us. That conception of nature as a blind causality which does a great many unintended things on its own account is a metaphysical superstition. This superstition is the source of the difficulty so many feel over the doctrine of evolution and, also, of the traditional polemic concerning prayer and special interpositions in general. The naturalistic interpretations of religious history have the same root. In all of these cases the assumption is commonly made that whatever can be referred to natural agency is thereby rescued from any supernatural or purposive interpretation. Here the question of naturalism or supernaturalism tacitly becomes a question of atheism or theism.

But if the supernatural be the living reality of the natural these difficulties disappear. All the believer cares to maintain is that events are intended, however realized; and what the unbeliever should show, in order to give his claim any significance, is that the event roots in no purpose anywhere. If it represents a divine purpose it is as truly purposeful when real-

ized through natural processes as it would be if produced by fiat, and it would be as "special" or "particular" if thus produced as it would be if created on the spot. In any other sense than that of being intended it is unnecessary to insist upon anything special or particular in the flow of events; and in this sense it is hard to see how any theist can reserve anything from being special and particular. We may, indeed, not be able to trace the divine meaning in an event, but if there be meaning in anything there is meaning in all things.

Curious oversights are apt to master us here. To begin with, the fallacy of the universal misleads us into thinking that the creative act produced only a system of things in general, which system then wrought out a set of particular effects on its own account for which no one is responsible. General laws and classes were the first and only created product; thereafter things got on by themselves. But these laws and classes, as such, contain no hint of concrete and particular things and events, and hence the latter are thought to be no part of the original plan. Through this deceit of the universal they fall out of our thought and are not supposed to have been in the creative thought. Thus, finally, they sink down into unintended by-products of the natural mechanism and admit of being thought meanly of.

The naïve superficiality of all this is evident. General laws and classes can exist apart from intelligence only in concrete and particular application. There is and can be no system of things in general. If, then, we suppose that God created a system of nature which was intended to unfold according to inherent laws we must say that the creative act implied and carried with it all that should ever arrive in the unfolding of the system. There is no way by which things or events could slip in which were not provided for. Each minutest event was potential in the primal arrangement, or it could not have happened. Mechanism can only unfold its own implications; it can make no new departures so as to reach anything essentially new. And if we suppose the Creator to have known what he was doing we must either suppose him to have intended the consequences or to have been unable to prevent them. But this question of intended or unintended, which is the only important one in this matter, is obscured by supposing the issue

to concern only the method of realization; as if the natural were necessarily unrelated to intelligence, and as if the supernatural must be unnatural in its methods.

The same crude conception underlies much of our philosophy of history and not a little of our biblical discussion; but into this field we forbear to enter. Concerning the miracles of the Bible we remark only that, while not intending in any way to deny them, we may yet be helped in accepting them by our general conception of a natural supernatural and a supernatural natural.

The net result of this discussion is not very great. We have gained some insight into the abysses of metaphysics which underlie the question and, especially, into the crude metaphysics which underlies the popular conception. The rest of the conclusion may be summed up as follows:

The physical world and the mental world are the two realms of experience. In both worlds things exist and events happen in certain ways. These are the discoverable uniformities of experience which are the great field of practical science. Events occurring in accordance with this order we call natural. Neither of these worlds goes along strictly by itself, but each is modified by the other. The fancy that physical science is overthrown if we allow the continuity of physical movement to be affected by anything beyond the physical series is a piece of intelligible, but not intelligent, scientific prudery. Along with this must be placed the fancy that mental science is overthrown if we allow any freedom of will. The continuity which a sane science demands is simply a community of law for all events, old and new alike. The dream of a metaphysical continuity in the finite system, whereby each antecedent stage dynamically causes its consequent stage, is only a dream. Neither member of the finite system can be understood in itself, and either, taken alone, is but a one-sided abstraction from the reality. Neither can these members be understood when taken together, apart from reference to a fundamental reality which is the source and ground of both. Here is where both the physical world and the finite spirit have their root; and any absolute science of either must involve an absolute knowledge of this basal being. The impossibility of interpreting this being materially or mechanically and the necessity of interpreting it after the

analogy of free and spiritual existence are shown by the results of all philosophy which has risen above the sense-plane. From this standpoint nature is no self-sufficient, brute existence in space and time; but all finite existence is but a product or manifestation of which God is the ever-present administrator and ground, and natural laws are at bottom only his ways of working in the production and connection of things and events. And these, in turn, are due, not to any mechanical causation behind them, but to the ceaseless causal activity of the basal reality which forever produces them according to his plan and purpose. If, then, we would find the true cause of things we must look for it, not at the unattainable beginning of a temporal series, but in the Living Will, which not only worketh hitherto, but worketh still and worketh for evermore.

Borden P. Bowne.

ART. II.—JOHN RUSKIN: A STUDY IN LOVE AND RELIGION.

MR. COLLINGWOOD'S *Life and Work of John Ruskin* has thrown some welcome light on the religious views of our great art critic and on those "affairs of the heart" which in his case have, as with one consent, contrived to run anything but smoothly. These personal touches form the charm of the new biography. Ruskin's name has so long been a household word among us that any glimpse into his private life which is allowed us seems to establish a closer intimacy with an old friend and lend new meaning and pathos to his prosperous, yet sadly clouded, course. Ruskin himself took the world into his confidence years ago in *Præterita*, that history which, as Mrs. Ritchie says, is not written with ink, "but painted down with light and color." His friend Mr. Collingwood has drawn largely on those reminiscences, but has been able to supplement them with facts gathered from private sources and carefully gleaned during twenty years of intimate association with the master. Much light is thus thrown on Ruskin's history, from his first days in London right on to the present hour, when "the plow stands in the furrow and the laborer passes peacefully from his toil, homewards." No one has less to fear from such unveiling. Ruskin's great gifts have been nobly devoted to noble ends. Those who differ most from him in his teaching on art, on political economy, or on education do not fail to pay tribute to the high-souled sincerity that has shaped his conduct. His unselfish generosity and his manly scorn of everything base or unworthy have won for John Ruskin the loving respect of all good men.

The early chapters of *Præterita* have made the story of his boyhood a kind of English classic. His grandfather, a young wine merchant in Edinburgh, ran away with Catherine Tweddale from her father's manse at Glenluce, in Wigtownshire, when she was a bright and animated brunette not yet sixteen. The young couple settled in the old town, at the head of George Wynd. A little daughter was born to them a year afterward. A few weeks later a friend, who came into the room unannounced, found the young mother, not yet seventeen, "dancing

a threesome reel, with two chairs as partners, she having found at the moment no other way of adequately expressing the pleasure she took in this mortal life and its gifts and promises." The Ruskins belonged to the upper middle class and had a pleasant circle of friends in Edinburgh. Their son, John James, went to the high school, then prospering exceedingly under the care of Dr. Adam. When school days were over he set out to London to push his fortunes in the office of Gordon, Murphy & Co., wine merchants. There Mr. Peter Domecq, owner of famous vineyards at Macharnudo, in Spain, who had come to England to learn his business, was his fellow-clerk. He formed so high an opinion of young Ruskin's ability that when the house of Gordon broke up he offered him the management of his London agency. The new firm, Ruskin, Telford & Domecq, opened a modest office in Billiter Street in 1809.

Young Ruskin returned to Edinburgh for a visit. His cousin Margaret had come to keep house for his father a few years before. Her mother kept the Old King's Head at Croydon. Margaret had been the pattern girl and best needlewoman in Mrs. Rice's school there. "Tall and handsome, pious and practical, she was just the girl to become the confidante and adviser of her dark-eyed, active, and romantic young cousin—his guardian angel." The cousins now became engaged. She was four years older than himself; but the young people felt that their marriage must wait till circumstances would permit them to set up housekeeping. The elder Ruskin had gradually ruined himself. When he became insolvent his son worked hard to satisfy the creditors. Nine years of assiduous toil, without a holiday, saw all debts wiped off and the young firm in Billiter Street so well established that its energetic chief felt at last free to marry. He hastened north to claim his cousin's hand. Margaret was inclined to wait, but one evening was persuaded into a prompt marriage. Next morning her husband bore her off in triumph to London.

They set up housekeeping at 54 Hunter Street, Brunswick Square, where John Ruskin was born February 8, 1819. His mother told him that, like Hannah, she had devoted him to God before he was born. Mrs. Ruskin lavished all her care upon her only child. Mr. Collingwood thinks that "the reli-

gious instinct so conspicuous in him is a heritage from Scotland; so is his conscience and code of morality, part emotional, part logical, and often unlike an Englishman's in the points that satisfy or shock it." The home training had some taint of Spartan hardness; but its systematic Bible study bore memorable fruit in later years. Every morning after breakfast mother and son went through two or three chapters, reading aloud alternate verses. Every syllable, from Genesis to Revelation, was taken in turn, hard names and all. They got through the Bible in about twelve months, and read it over together thus at least six times. After the daily chapters were finished John had to learn some verses before twelve o'clock. Nothing was allowed to interfere with this task. "To that discipline," Ruskin says, "patient, accurate, and resolute, I owe not only a knowledge of the book, which I find occasionally serviceable, but much of my general power of taking pains and the best part of my taste in literature." Peace, obedience, faith—these were the graces on which chief stress was laid in the Ruskin nursery. The Bible readings were interrupted by the first continental journey when John Ruskin was fourteen. He now read a chapter by himself morning and evening, "of course, saying the Lord's Prayer after it and asking for everything that was nice for myself and my family."

A compact sermon delivered at the age of three shows that Ruskin was never exactly an evangelical. The little fellow climbed into the chair in which he still sits in the evenings at Brantwood and said: "People, be dood. If you are dood, God will love you. If you are not dood, God will not love you. People, be dood." There were serious defects in his training:

I had nothing to love. My parents were, in a sort, visible powers of nature to me, no more loved than the sun and the moon. . . . Still less did I love God; not that I had any quarrel with him or fear of him, but simply found what people told me was his service disagreeable and what people told me was his book not entertaining. I had no companions to quarrel with, neither; nobody to assist and nobody to thank.

He accepted his home teaching without question. It seemed that all required of him was to say his prayers, go to church, learn his lessons, obey his parents, and enjoy his dinner. He describes himself as "by protection innocent, instead of by practice virtuous." The literary instinct awoke early. At

six the child author began to imitate the books he had read and to make his first attempts at poetry. He soon became deeply interested in mineralogy, one of the studies which has exercised over him a lifelong fascination. Before he went to Oxford he had become Turner's champion, roused thereto by an attack made on the painter in *Blackwood's*. But, precocious as he was in these respects, he took his religion at second hand. Like his parents, he was a strict Protestant, though not exclusively attached to any party. "He had seen the good side of more than one school of Protestant Christianity, and their weak points as well. So that an ecclesiastical contest had no interest for him; he could take neither side."

Ruskin was intended for the Church; but when he went up to Oxford the tides of religious controversy which were beginning to flow there at the end of the thirties made no impression on his mind. "It seems strange," says Mr. Collingwood, "that a man who had been brought up on constant Bible-reading and sermon-hearing, who was destined for the Church, whose eventual mission has been to refer everything to the language and principles of religion—it seems strange that he, of all people, should have looked on unmoved while great questions were being agitated, consciences wrung, and souls torn asunder between faith and doubt." The fact is, Ruskin had scarcely begun to think on such matters.

His college course was uneventful. He won the Newdigate by his poem "Salsette and Elephanta;" but just when he seemed ripe for honors in the schools his health gave way. His friends had expected that a few months would have seen him safely launched on an honorable and dignified profession. His illness changed everything. He was forbidden to read and sent abroad to winter. All hope of distinction at the university thus vanished. When he had found his true vocation Ruskin overheard his father talking with one of their artist friends, who regretted that the young man had been imprudent enough to write about Turner and Raphael, instead of explaining to the people the way of salvation. An admirable clergyman had thus been lost. "Yes," said his father, with tears in his eyes, "he would have been a bishop."

An unfortunate love affair was the secret of his breakdown. Ruskin gives a pleasant picture in *Præterita* of an evening

spent with the family of his father's partner, Mr. Domecq, in Paris. The English boy of fourteen, who could speak very little French, was feeling hopelessly in the cold when Elise Domecq, a girl of nine, came across the room and chattered to him for an hour and a half, "requiring no answer, of which she saw I was incapable, but satisfied with my grateful and respectful attention and admiring interest, if not exactly always in what she said, at least in the way she said it." Three years later, in the beginning of 1836, a few weeks after the Ruskins had returned from Italy, Mr. Domecq came over to England with four of his daughters. The eldest sister had just been married to Count Maison. The visit made no small stir in the Ruskin household. "How we got them all into Herne Hill corners and cupboards would be inexplicable but with a plan of the three stories! The arrangements were half Noah's ark, half doll's house; but we got them all in." They were the first really well-bred and well-dressed girls John had met—"a most curious galaxy, or Southern Cross, of unconceived stars floating on a sudden into my obscure firmament of London suburb." The girls were foreigners and convent-bred Catholics; but the youth of seventeen was soon entirely bewitched by the eldest of them, Adèle Clotilde, a graceful, oval-faced blonde of fifteen. Adèle, "sternly and accurately" sensible, altogether failed to understand her bashful lover, whose "uneasiness bred an appearance of antagonism. In fit upon fit of shyness he disputed, prosed, sulked, did everything that could alienate a bright girl—from Paris, too; whose notions of British morgue and phlegm were only too justified by his want of style and his obvious awkwardness." His very seriousness repelled his gay visitor. When he wrote a story to amuse her the note of passion in it only made her laugh.

But the boyish passion was not dampened by such rebuffs. When the girls returned to France the sunshine seemed to have gone with them. The young lover bravely set himself to win some distinction which might enable him to carry his suit. In 1838 the girls were sent to a convent school at Chelmsford to perfect their English. Ruskin and his mother went to see them there in August. The Christmas vacation found the Domecqs again at Herne Hill. Ruskin was now a rising young man, but he did not find favor in Adèle's eyes. The girl, who was "not in the least amiable," only laughed at his attentions. He won-

dered mightily in later years what sort of creature he should have turned out if love had been with him instead of being against him.

Ruskin's father deplored the state of mind into which his son had been brought by Adèle. Mr. Wardell, one of his neighbors in Billiter Street, older and richer than himself, had an only daughter, very beautiful, entirely good and gentle, and carefully educated. Young Ruskin was invited to spend the afternoon and dine at Hampstead. Miss Wardell was "a softly molded, slender brunette, with her father's dark-curling hair transfigured into playful grace round the pretty, modest, not unthoughtful, gray-eyed face." Ruskin did his best to be agreeable, not without result. The young lady came over to Herne Hill to pay a return visit, and Ruskin remembered "her looking a little frightenedly pleased at his kneeling down to hold a book for her, or some such matter." His father and mother now asked him seriously what he thought of her. He frankly explained that, though he saw all her beauty and merit and niceness, she was yet not his sort of girl. The negotiations went no further at the time, and soon afterward Miss Wardell died of nervous fever. In March, 1840, Adèle Domecq married young Baron Duquesne. This was a bitter trial to John Ruskin. Mrs. Ritchie tells us that she could understand the charm of the French girls; for once by chance, traveling on Lake Leman, she saw a beautiful young lady on the steamer, all dressed in gray, with a long veil floating on the wind:

The story of the French sisters has gained an added interest from the remembrance of those dark, lovely eyes, that charming countenance; for afterward, when I knew her better, the lady told me that her mother had been a Domecq and had once lived with her three sisters in Ruskin's home. Circumstances had divided them in after days; but all the children of the family had been brought up to know Mr. Ruskin by name and to love and appreciate his books.

Ruskin was twenty-one when his great disappointment came upon him. He was compelled to quit Oxford and spent two years wandering in quest of health. Gradually his mind regained tone. He was able to take interest in art and literature, and by and by went up to the university for his degree. The state of his health forbade him to think of entering the Church; and, indeed, his thoughts no longer turned in that direction. He

was drifting insensibly toward his true vocation. His drawing-master, J. D. Harding, who taught his pupil to observe as well as draw, had considerable influence in fixing the young man's course. One day Ruskin noticed a stem twined with ivy, which opened his eyes to the charm of nature's decorations. He saw that sincerity and truth must be the watchwords of true art. This was in May, 1842. Before the year was out he was hard at work on that first volume of *Modern Painters* which took the world of art and literature by storm in April, 1843.

Many things were changing in Ruskin's world. The Scotch Puritanism of his boyhood was too narrow for his mature years. His mother took him early to church, but in spite of his quiet habits and her golden vinaigrette, "always indulged to me there, and there only, that I might see the wreathed open pattern above the sponge, I found the bottom of the pew so extremely dull a place to keep quiet in (my best story-books being also taken away from me in the morning), that, as I have somewhere said before, the horror of Sunday used even to cast its prescient gloom as far back in the week as Friday, and all the glory of Monday, with church seven days removed again, was no equivalent for it." With all her earnestness Mrs. Ruskin had not learned the art of making her boy regard Sunday as the crown of the week's felicities. The gloom and horror of the day at Herne Hill stands in striking contrast to the delightful Sabbaths which John G. Paton chronicles in his autobiography. The lowly Scotch weaver knew how to surround God's day with double joy for his children.

The elder Ruskin, whose health had suffered much from hard work in his early business life, could not bear the long service of the Church of England. The family, therefore, went to Beresford Chapel, Walworth, where Dr. Andrews, father of Mrs. Coventry Patmore, the "angel in the house," was minister. They were allowed, not without offended and reproachful glances from the more conscientious worshipers, to come in when prayers were half over. Mrs. Ruskin was evidently more devoted to her religious duties than either her son or husband. John Ruskin speaks of a Sunday afternoon walk in Wales, "dashed only with some alarmed sense of the sin of being so happy among the hills, instead of writing out a sermon at home; my father's presence and countenance not

wholly comforting me, for we both of us had alike had a subdued consciousness of being profane and rebellious characters, compared to my mother." He tells us that when at Chamouni they witnessed "the entire manner of life in a purely Catholic village and valley, recognizing it, I hope, all of us, in our hearts, to be quite as Christian as anything we knew of and much pleasanter and prettier than the Sunday services in England, which exhausted the little faith we had left." In England his father liked going to church as little as did he himself.

Ruskin never thought of traveling, climbing, or sketching on Sunday for many years. He says: "My first infringement of this rule by climbing up the isolated peak above Gap, with both Couttet and George, after our morning service, remains a weight on my conscience to this day. But it was thirteen years later before I made a sketch on Sunday." This mountain climb was in the spring of 1845. It was the first shot fired in a war which Mr. Collingwood describes as "one of the strangest and saddest wars between conscience and reason that biography records; strange, because the opposing forces were so nearly matched, and sad, because the struggle lasted until their field of battle was desolated before either won a victory." It now began to dawn upon Ruskin that men had been curiously judging themselves by always calling the day of judgment *dies iræ*, instead of *dies amoris*. He became an interested student of Roman Catholicism. Many traces of this feeling survive in *Præterita*. At Sallenches, in 1849, he found that the people wrote down their sins in order to spare their memories, as they only went to confession once a year. The landlord's daughter expressed her horror of "losing one's sins" and of their being found by some one who was not a confessor. The villagers spoke, with great pleasure, of a Capuchin's visits. He "preached so well that everybody listened with all their might, so that you might tap them on the back and they would never turn round." They were not so favorable to the Jesuits, who would not allow a single sin to be committed by persons coming to them in general confessions. An old servant at the inn spoke a patois which the priest did not understand. He could not tell whether she knew her catechism and would not give her absolution. The poor, disappointed creature "raved and wept and was in a passion with all the world."

A year or two later Ruskin chanced upon a little fourteenth century *Hours of the Virgin* at some bookseller's in a back alley. No girl of seven years old could be happier with a new doll than he was with this treasure. The feeling was something between the girl's with her doll and Aladdin's with his lamp. He had found "a new spirit slave to build palaces for him with jewel windows:"

For, truly, a well-illuminated missal is a fairy cathedral full of painted windows, bound together to carry in one's pocket, with the music and the blessing of all its prayers besides. And then followed, of course, the discovery that all beautiful prayers were Catholic, all wise interpretations of the Bible Catholic, and every manner of Protestant written services whatsoever either insolently altered corruptions or washed-out and ground-down rags and *débris* of the great Catholic collects, litanies, and songs of praise. People predicted his speedy conversion to Rome, but they were mistaken. He did not believe in the "living pope any more than in the living Khan of Tartary."

Ruskin was now in full revolt against the tenet in which he had been brought up, that people might not seek their own pleasure on Sunday or do anything useful on that day. "Gradually, in honest Bible reading, he saw that Christ's first article of teaching was to unbind the yoke of the Sabbath." The great Old Testament passages had, and still have, power over him; but he recognized that "the inveterate habit of being unhappy all Sunday did not in any way fulfill the order to call the Sabbath a delight." While in this mood he heard a Waldensian preacher at Turin denounce the wickedness of the world. This fastened him in the old article of Jewish faith, "that things done delightfully and rightly were always done by the help and in the spirit of God."

The weakness of many teachers of great reputation led him still further in revolt against their views. He loved Maurice, as everyone did who came near him, but could not bear the way in which he treated the Bible. "Maurice," he says, "was by nature puzzle-headed and, though in a beautiful manner, wrong-headed; while his clear conscience and keen affections made him egotistic and, in his Bible reading, as insolent as any infidel of them all." Ruskin went to hear his comments on the story of Jael. Maurice denounced the Jewish heroine. "Such dreadful deeds could only have been done in the dark

biblical ages." Ruskin ventured to inquire why, then, Deborah sang, "Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be." For answer Maurice denounced Deborah as a mere blazing Amazon. It was the first time, Ruskin says, "I had fairly met the lifted head of earnest and religious infidelity in a man neither vain nor ambitious, but instinctively and innocently trusting his own amiable feelings as the final interpreters of all the possible feelings of men and angels, all the songs of the prophets, and all the ways of God." The same feeling comes out in Ruskin's comment on the teaching of a leading evangelical, Mr. Molyneux, who spoke on the prodigal son at the Earl of Ducie's. Ruskin ventured to ask what the other son meant, and was told that he was "merely a picturesque figure introduced to fill the background of the parable agreeably, and contained no instruction or example for the well-disposed scriptural student, but, on the contrary, rather a snare for the unwary and a temptation to self-righteousness, which was, of all sins, the most offensive to God."

Ruskin had established his reputation as an art critic by the first volume of *Modern Painters*. His fame steadily grew with the work of the next four or five years. But his father and mother earnestly wished him to marry. His health was still far from satisfactory. At their solicitation, therefore, he visited Perth in 1847 and proposed to a young Scotch lady, the daughter of old friends there. She had visited Herne Hill when Ruskin's health was broken down and challenged the woe-begone lover to write a fairy-tale, as the task which seemed most out of his line. In a couple of sittings he produced "The King of the Golden River." Mr. Collingwood says:

She had grown up into a perfect Scotch beauty, another Fair Maid of Perth, with every gift of health and spirits which would compensate, as they thought, his retiring and morbid nature. And if she, by obedience to her own parents, got the wealth and position they sought for her, on the other hand the dutiful son easily persuaded himself that he was, after all, the luckiest of mortals. He was ready to do anything, to promise anything, for so charming a prize. The parents on each side had their several conditions to make, but united in hastening on the event, alike "dreaming of a perishable home."

They were married on April 10, 1848. The first days of the honeymoon were spent at Keswick, whence Ruskin wrote on

Good Friday to Miss Mitford. His letter has a somber earnestness, not without significance, as we trace the course of his ill-assorted marriage. "I begin to feel," he writes, "that all the work I have been doing and all the loves I have been cherishing are ineffective and frivolous; that these are not times for watching clouds or dreaming over quiet waters; that more serious work is to be done; and that the time for endurance has come rather than for meditation, and for hope rather than happiness." He reports that there was a good clergyman at Keswick, Mr. Myers, and that he was recovering trust and tranquillity. A noble thoughtfulness is manifest in these words; but we can understand that the gay young wife, full of life and spirits, was not altogether in sympathy with such a husband. The course of time revealed the dissimilarity between them more emphatically. Amid ceaseless labor, rendered increasingly trying by physical weakness, Ruskin found it needed no small effort "to do what he believed to be his duty toward a wife whose affection he earnestly sought, but whose tastes were discordant with his." Meanwhile there was "disappointment and disillusioning" for the "young girl, who found herself married, by parental arrangement, to a man with whom she had nothing in common; in habits of thought and life, though not so much in years, her senior; taking 'small notice, or austere,' of the gayer world she preferred." People were intensely puzzled when she left him after six years of married life; but the secret is not hard to fathom when we see in what different worlds these uncongenial spirits moved.

Ruskin worked on steadily after this great blow had laid the fabric of his domestic peace in the dust. We have seen that till he was forty he was a believer in English Protestantism. After that time he began to feel that he had to reconstruct all his religious theories. "He saw both Protestants and Roman Catholics, in the perspective of history, converging into a primitive, far-distant, ideal unity of Christianity, in which he still believed; but he could take neither side after this." His social theories also clamored for reconstruction. He buried himself among the Alps at Mornex to think matters out. "The loneliness is very great," he writes, "and the peace in which I am at present is only as if I had buried myself in a tuft of grass on a battlefield wet with blood; for the cry of the earth about me is in my ears continu-

ally if I do not lay my head to the very ground." A little later he says, "I am still very unwell, and tormented between the longing for rest and lovely life and the sense of this terrific call of human crime for resistance and of human misery for help, though it seems to me as the voice of a river of blood, which can but sweep me down in the midst of its black clots, helpless." The sequel to this mental struggle is well known. The admired art critic became the heretic economist, who thundered against orthodoxy in religion, morals, politics, art, science, and social life, to find himself scouted as a fanatic dreamer. Thackeray had to tell him that his papers in *Cornhill* were so unanimously condemned and disliked that he could only admit one more. His father's displeasure was harder still to bear. It seemed to the old man as though his son was wantonly throwing away his reputation and earning for himself the name of fool. Yet amid all his heresies Ruskin's heart was right. However strongly we may dissent from his teachings, we admire him even more as the champion of the oppressed, with the burden of the world rousing him to indignation, than when we see him preaching his crusade against insincerity and falsehood in art.

In 1867 he gave the Rede Lecture at Cambridge. In his impressive peroration he urged on the younger men "the infinite importance of a life of virtue and the fact that the hereafter must be spent in God's presence or in darkness." He reminded the heads of the university that their continued prosperity must rest on their obedience to the command of their divine Master, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness." "All mere abstract knowledge, independent of its tendency to a holy life, was useless." He had drifted far from his old moorings; but the man who could utter such words was certain to be led into clearer light by and by. In 1868 he fell under the influence of St. Ursula, who became, as he visited Venice time after time for her sake, a spiritual presence and an inspiration. "What would St. Ursula say?" led him to cultivate patience and gentleness under many provocations. His mother died in 1871. A still heavier blow was impending. He had become attached to one of his pupils, a lady much younger than himself. His friends hoped that at fifty-three he was at last to drink the cup of domestic happiness. But the lady was

an earnest Christian. She could not make up her mind to marry one who seemed to scoff at her faith. She therefore turned resolutely away from the happiness which she so much coveted. The sacrifice cost her her life. Three years later, when she lay dying, Ruskin begged to see her. "She sent to ask whether he could yet say that he loved God better than he loved her; and when he said 'No,' her door was closed upon him forever." She died on May 29, 1875.

Ruskin sought refuge in work from the greatest sorrow of his life. His writing in *Fors Clavigera* became more serious and earnest in tone. When an Aberdeen teacher asked for a New Year's message for his Bible class Ruskin replied: "The condemnation given from the judgment throne—most solemnly described—is all for the 'undones,' and not for the 'dones.' People are perpetually afraid of doing wrong; but, unless they are doing its reverse energetically, they do it all day long, and the degree does not matter." He said plainly that he did not know there was another existence; he hoped there was. Gradually clearer vision came. On Christmas Day, 1876, he seemed to gain that assurance of another life for which he had been looking since his great bereavement. "His intense despondency changed for a while into a singular happiness; it seemed a renewed health and strength, and, instead of despair, he rejoiced in the conviction of guarding providences and helpful influences." His writings now showed traces of a profound mysticism. He renounced his skeptical judgments and searched the Bible more carefully than ever to find its hidden meanings. The following December he lectured to a crowded audience at Oxford, "this interest of theirs being granted to me, I doubt not, because for the first time in Oxford I have been able to speak to them boldly of immortal life." In 1879 he prepared a series of lectures on the Lord's Prayer for the Furness Clerical Society's meetings. He spoke about the need of living faith in God's fatherhood and of childlike obedience to the commands of old-fashioned religion and morality. "No man," he said, "more than I has ever loved the place where God's honor dwells or yielded truer allegiance to the teaching of his evident servants. No man, at this time, grieves more for the damage of the Church which supposes him her enemy, while she whispers procrastinating *pax vobiscum* in answer to

the spurious kiss of those who would fain toll curfew over the last fires of English faith and watch the sparrow find a nest where she may lay her young around the altars of the Lord." He describes himself in a later letter as "only a Christian Catholic, in the wide and eternal sense. I have been that these five and twenty years, at least. Heaven keep me from being less as I grow older! But I am no more likely to become a Roman Catholic than a Quaker, Evangelical, or Turk."

Perhaps the most pleasant glimpse of Ruskin's religious feeling is found in his talk to the Coniston children after a dinner which he gave them in January, 1881. They had been singing "Jesu, here from sin deliver." "That is what we want," he said—"to be delivered from our sins. We must look to the Saviour to deliver us from our sin. It is right we should be punished for the sins which we have done; but God loves us and wishes to be kind to us and to help us that we may not willfully sin." Family prayers at Brantwood were in these days conducted by Ruskin himself, whose carefully prepared Bible reading sometimes lasted longer than the household found quite convenient. He wrote collects, which still exist, "deeply interesting as the prayers of a man who had passed through so many wildernesses of thought and doubt, and had returned at last, not to the fold of the Church, but to the footstool of the Father." With that touching scene the curtain may fittingly fall on this record of the inner life of one whom all earnest men honor as a preacher of sincerity and truth. For John Ruskin there has been "but one reality—the great fact, as he knew it, of God above, and man either obeying or withstanding him."

John Jefferson

ART. III.—THE HUMANE SPIRIT IN HEBREW LEGISLATION.

ANYONE who has studied the code of laws, and the comments and exhortations of the prophets on them, contained in the Old Testament must be convinced that this legislation was designed to be exceptionally humane and beneficent. Its fundamental principle is the inestimable value of human life, even in a merely physical existence. This is the gift of God and cannot be despised or maltreated, because man is made in the divine image and the creature owes to the Creator a responsibility and trust that cannot under any circumstances be bartered away or forfeited. The relation extends to all the conditions of human subsistence, and must be carefully preserved in all the ramifications of society, comprehending its humblest member. Mosaism, in its exhibition of tender concern for the decaying body, is the natural precursor of the evangelical doctrine that places a priceless estimate on the worth of the immortal soul. Here was a system that contained the germ out of which was developed the most enlarged Christian philanthropy.

It was the purpose of the Israelitish order to preserve the equality of all citizens in the eyes of the law, and to maintain, as far as practicable, the equilibrium of wealth among them. Extreme poverty was regarded as an evil to be prevented and palliated as far as possible; but the penniless were not to be annihilated because they were unable to contribute to the general stock. A spirit of sympathy was enjoined because the sons of Jacob were brethren, and they were to remember that they had been bondmen in the land of Egypt. Isaac M. Wise* asserts that, "as regards the laws of charity [benevolence] and tolerance especially, the most enlightened modern nations have not yet reached the eminence of the Mosaic law."

Illustrations of the kindly provision for the poor are numerous and scattered throughout the *Torah*. Let a few suffice. On general principles the Hebrew was thus instructed: "Thou shalt not harden thine heart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother: but thou shalt open thine hand wide unto him, and

* *History of the Israelitish Nation*, vol. 1, pp. 151, 152.

shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need" (Deut. xv, 7, 8). In regard to such a one it was commanded, "Take thou no usury of him, or increase" (Lev. xxv, 36). For particular acts, the more prosperous were directed to aid the poor in the second tithe taken on the increase of the third year (Deut. xiv, 28, 29). At harvest "thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and the stranger: I am the Lord your God" (Lev. xix, 9, 10). Observe here the authority for the injunction. Likewise the forgotten sheaf was to remain "for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow" (Deut. xxiv, 19). When a pledge for a loan was exacted it was commanded with a fine sense of delicacy: "Thou shalt not go into his house to fetch his pledge. Thou shalt stand abroad, and the man to whom thou dost lend shall bring out the pledge abroad unto thee" (Deut. xxiv, 10, 11). How grateful some poor seamstresses and washerwomen would be nowadays if this injunction were observed: "The wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning" (Lev. xix, 13). In legal procedures the poor were to be protected: "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take a widow's raiment to pledge" (Deut. xxiv, 17). For similar instructions read Exod. xxii, 22-27; xxiii, 9.

The enforcement of these humane provisions seems to have been an important part of the later prophets' mission. An indignant spirit is aroused in Amos because, during the prosperous and luxurious reign of Jeroboam II over the northern kingdom, "they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes," and because they panted "after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor" and turned aside "the way of the meek" (Amos ii, 6, 7). Was there ever a keener and more vigorous metaphor—greedy land-grabbers begrudging the little earth used by the stricken as a sign of their distress? Micah appeals to the mountains as witnesses of the Lord's controversy with Judah, because the people thought to gain favor by the multitude of sacrifices, rather than in doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with their God. There could be no reconcilia-

tion so long as "the treasures of wickedness" remained "in the house of the wicked, . . . for the rich men thereof are full of violence" (Micah vi, 10-12). Isaiah, in the sublimity of his terrific arraignment, charges that the hands of his people are full of blood. He insists that there is only one condition of forgiveness and restoration: "Cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (i, 16, 17). Jeremiah, the prophet whose memory is most cherished among the Jews, boldly conditions the continuance of the kingdom on a radical reform in the treatment of the stranger, the fatherless, the widow, and him who has been spoiled by the hand of the oppressor (xxii, 3). Malachi, notwithstanding his zeal for the reformation of the temple worship and the restoration of the ecclesiastical revenues, at the same time assures the people that the Lord "will be a swift witness against . . . those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right" (iii, 5). Daniel, the eminent statesman and true servant of the living God, appears in the most majestic rôle when he so eloquently and pathetically advises Nebuchadnezzar to break off his sins "by righteousness" and his iniquities "by showing mercy to the poor" (iv, 27).

In the poetical books there are numerous expressions to show the growth of the humane sentiment. It is clear that there was no wane in the recognition of justice for the weak. In Psalm xli, 1, a benediction is pronounced on those who consider the poor. In Psalm cxii, 9, a man is accounted righteous because he hath given to the poor. Psalm lxxii describes the typical king as saving the poor and needy. Job in his defense claimed that he was a father to the poor (xxix, 16), and that his soul was grieved for them (xxx, 25). He calls his accusers to witness if he had ever withheld the poor from their desire (xxxii, 16-21). So the Book of Proverbs teaches: "He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker" (xiv, 31); "He that hath mercy on the poor, happy is he" (xiv, 21). Let these quotations suffice. For others reference may be made to a concordance. Well was it said in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

While it was a duty to furnish immediate relief to the needy

no Hebrew was to be pauperized.* His self-respect must be maintained, and he must not be deprived of the privilege of working for a livelihood. Money was loaned, not donated. Food was given in the natural state, and it must be prepared for eating. If he fell into debt he might be sold as a servant, but he was still to remember that he was not a chattel whose manhood had been forfeited, for at the end of the sixth year he was free to pursue his own vocation. No son of Abraham could become a hopeless slave. Though multitudes were taken captive in war and sold into a miserable bondage, they indignantly protested against the infringement of their inherent claims, as expressed in a reply to Jesus: "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man." When a Hebrew was thus temporarily enslaved the master was enjoined to treat him with the most considerate clemency. When released he was not to be sent away empty, but was to be furnished liberally from the flock, out of the threshing floor and out of the wine press (Deut. xv, 13, 14). Even a slave purchased *in perpetuo* could not be maltreated without thereby gaining manumission (Exod. xxi, 26, 27). Every master must remember that in his ancestry he had been "a bondman in the land of Egypt," and that the Lord his God had redeemed him (Deut. xv, 15) because the Creator had compassion on the work of his hands. The half shekel required of every man of the children of Israel as a "ransom for his soul unto the Lord" (Exod. xxx, 12-16) served as a constant and delicate reminder that he was a permanent citizen who could not be disfranchised, and that in some sense, at least before the Lord, one man might be as good as another. "The rich and poor meet together: the Lord is the maker of them all." Very often a per capita tax is regarded as a burden, whereas it may be esteemed as a pledge of equality before the law. In the sanctuary an Israelite could but feel a sense of his importance. Jehovah would take no cognizance of incidental concomitants which constitute no essential part of the real person and individuality. Religion formed the very basis of civil society. All life in Palestine converged to the temple, and it was the Lord who dwelt between the cherubim.

* See Rev. Morris Joseph's address on "Jewish Ethics" in *Religious Systems of the World*, pp. 699, 700.

By the law of tribal inheritance land could not be permanently alienated. Such a regulation may perhaps now be regarded as a very crude attempt to counteract tendencies sure to result in gross abuse; but its purpose was commendable, and it served to educate the people fully as much by its temper and its spirit as by its immediate application. Whatever may be the opinion of the reader on the views advocated by Henry George, there has ever existed indisputably a crying evil in the accumulation of large estates under the unchallenged ownership of a single individual. Such an individual in the Bible is treated as an enemy of society and under the divine ban. "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth!" says Isaiah (v, 8). How is it now, when the land is leased for a short term by tenants, or worse, when it is cultivated in large tracts by mere hirelings under command of the proprietor? Schools and churches cannot flourish. No incentive is offered for permanent social improvements. The neighborhood feeling is utterly destroyed. Immorality increases. The denizens are apt to give themselves up to sensuality and debasing pleasure. They seek exclusively the enjoyments of a day, for they have neither responsibility nor interest in the place and its future. To rebuke this vicious tendency, always existing, the story of Naboth's vineyard was recorded. King Ahab was entirely willing to give a money or land equivalent for the coveted plot; but had Naboth assented he would have been disloyal to that legal system which was designed to preserve to him and his fellow-citizens their inherent rights to the soil. The crime of the royal house, which put the worship of Jehovah to scorn, consisted in the determination to overrule this sacred provision for the independence of the Hebrew family. As long as the law of home tenure was in force, so long would it be impossible for the rich to secure a monopoly of the fief, and thereby multiply their dependents and sap the strength from the conditions of a prosperous society. By the tribal assignment of nonforfeitable estates the population was more likely to be evenly distributed, so that one section would not gain overweening ascendancy or advantage of another, and the clashing of classes and localities would be largely avoided.

The religious festivals occurring at stated periods were especially utilized for the comfort and elevation of the poor. There was one mitigating feature in the American system of slavery, for the negro always looked forward to Christmas week as an unconditioned respite from his galling servitude. For the covenant people, however, the feasts of the Lord were very frequent, and they invariably brought occasion of cheer to the unfortunate. The celebration of the feast ordained for the month Adar, and called Purim, consisted largely in the sending of gifts to the poor. When the feast of tabernacles was restored in the days of Nehemiah the people dwelt in booths in order to place themselves in some sort of equality. One part of the ceremony required that they should "send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared," very much as the custom was in the times of the old-fashioned camp meetings, which did so much for the regeneration of pioneer communities. If land had been mortgaged it was returned to the original family owners on the recurrence of the seventh, or sabbatical, year, which must have been an occasion of great gladness to those who by misfortune or mismanagement had signed away their right to the annual product of the earth. There might seem to be a discrimination against the creditor, who must relinquish the use of the ground; but he understood when he opened the account how far the borrower was allowed to involve his estate. It is true that an improvident debtor might be embarrassed because he could get no credit of value beyond the year of release; but the law was instituted to prevent him from pauperizing himself. Both creditor and debtor classes would receive advantage from a law that prohibited absolute impoverishment of any member of society. More grateful still was the year of jubilee—an event that might occur in the lifetime of any citizen—and yet so infrequent as not likely to happen more than once. In ordering the feast it was said, "Ye shall not therefore oppress one another" (Lev. xxv, 17). By Americans it ought especially to be remembered as having given occasion for the edict inscribed upon the Liberty Bell, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof" (Lev. xxv, 10). Charles Wesley caught the true spirit of the institution in the refrain to his celebrated hymn, "Blow ye the trumpet, blow." For the Hebrew serv-

ant the sabbatical year might happen whenever the term of his servitude expired ; but bond service could not extend over the jubilee.

Of all festivals the Sabbath of days was most benign in its aim toward the poor. All regular toil and much of the daily routine of ordinary labor must cease. As at the present, though so often misconstrued, it was the poor man's friend. It prevented master or employer from driving the toiler to death. That which might be pursued with vigor for six days became unlawful on the Sabbath ; so that even a slave for one seventh of the time was owner of himself, a very humane provision which secured to the most abject complete exemption from his debasing condition for a portion of his time. He had ample opportunity for the cultivation of those thoughts and emotions which would develop his moral manhood and bring him to a sense of his responsible relation to God. The feast was not only a holiday, but better, a holy day for growth in religion, of which the chief earthly feature is the manifestation of love for one's neighbor.

In various minor ways the value of human life was inculcated. When a house was erected the occupant was required to maintain a firm battlement around the edge of the roof (Deut. xxii, 8). Parents must manifest a wide consideration for the well-being of their children ; and it was forbidden, as a most horrid crime, to sacrifice offspring unto Moloch or any other of the savage idols worshiped by surrounding nations. The patriarchal order, which had invested Abraham with unquestionable authority over the life of Isaac, was wholly abrogated, and in the responsibility for individual existence no one could stand between the possessor of it and his God. Lynch law was not allowed, and the occasion for its exercise was removed by the substitution of a simple and impressive *lex talionis*. If murder occurred, the nearest of kin to the victim was charged with the duty of avengement. Cities of refuge for the unfortunate offender, conveniently located throughout the land, were monumental reminders of the sanctity of human life. As they were priestly residences, there came to be an indissoluble association between exemption from capital punishment and the ceremonies of a religion which formed the vital framework of civil society. An inno-

cent perpetrator was bound to stay in his chosen sanctuary until the death of the high priest who stood for the present order of things. Life began anew with another pontiff, for it was sacred before God. Not even an irrational creature could escape with impunity when life was destroyed (Exod. xxi, 28-32). There were also given some very tender admonitions in regard to the treatment of dumb animals, so that the purpose of a modern society for the prevention of cruelty was long anticipated. Some progressive scientists have urged, apparently as an original idea, that the right of brutes to live and enjoy themselves should not be causelessly invaded. Even when Jewish legalism had gone to seed it did not fail to exercise a lively compassion for the comfort of beasts.

While polygamy and divorce were permitted they were not encouraged, and woman's rights were respected far beyond the custom of contemporary nations. Isaac Mayer Wise says * that the maxim was current among the people, "Who is divorced of his first wife, has made the same experience as if the temple had been destroyed in his days." "A case of divorce," he adds, "belonged to the anomalies of the law." The husband of a bride was exempt from military service for one year after the wedding, and that among a people who were under strict martial discipline (Deut. xxiv, 5). Caution of the most gallant nature was obligatory when the life or shapeliness of unborn infants was imperiled (Exod. xxi, 22, 23). A delicate respect for others' misfortunes is required in the law, "Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumbling-block before the blind" (Lev. xix, 14).

Let this system of legislation be compared with the codes in practice among other nations. It cannot be asserted that the Hebrews monopolize all the kind and considerate regard for humanity; but they were preeminent in laying the foundation for an ideal philanthropy.

The Spartans were distinguished for vigor of life and sturdiness of character, but at what a sacrifice of individual rights! The fundamental principle in the laws of Lycurgus was the subordination of the single life to that corporate abstraction, the State. Weakling infants were exposed on Mount Taygetus to die or be brought up with the Pericæci. The males

* *History of the Israelitish Nation*, vol. I, p. 146.

were fed at the public table and on a very plain diet, of which a part was black broth. The boys were scourged at the altar of Artemis, until blood gushed from their bodies, in the presence of their parents. Family life in the Christian sense was wholly impossible. The condition of the Helots was exceedingly deplorable, for they were permanently and hopelessly enslaved to the land.* Lysurgus may have entertained a worthy purpose in this legislation, and may have been actuated by the maxim, "The greatest good of the greatest number;" but the body politic cannot exist for its own sake. The Hebrew economy was instituted to develop and exalt individual life. In Athens there was greater freedom, but it was said that the laws of Draco were written in blood, and Solon was employed to create a reform in the government; yet his work was entirely devoid of the religious motive which has given permanency to the Hebrew system.

There is a striking contrast in the social regimen of the Israelites and that of the Roman people. While by many the laws of the twelve tables have been regarded as the palimpsest on which the code of modern liberty has been written, not enough credit has been given to the system of Moses in the formulation of political ideas.† Personal right was acquired by severe and persistent struggles on the banks of the Tiber. The children of Israel were taught to believe that their *Magna Charta* was granted simultaneously with the foundation of the State. Many acts of injustice were perpetrated by the representatives of royalty in Jerusalem and Samaria, as numerous and scathing rebukes by the prophets unmistakably show; and there can be no question but that Solomon's reign was a vicious tyranny by which the poor were often bitterly oppressed. These instances of abuse can be readily duplicated at any time in the history of Rome; while on all such flagrant and impious oppressions the religious teachers in Israel pronounced the wrath and punishment of God. The Book of Deuteronomy, whose reading so alarmed Josiah, most vigorously condemns ambitious and unprincipled kings and rulers who would seek their own delight at the expense of the

* See Smith's *History of Greece*, Felton's edition, pp. 63-65; also Curtius (vol. 1, pp. 214-222), who does not view the matter in so dark a phase.

† See H. A. Harper, *The Bible and Modern Discoveries*, pp. 140, 141.

masses. In Hebrew annals there does not appear any such protracted and organized conflict as that between the plebeians and the patricians of the Roman republic. There was nothing to correspond with the servile wars which so disturbed the Latin races. If the tribune of the *plebs* had the sanction of his own convictions and of public sympathy to sustain his efforts in behalf of popular rights, the Hebrew prophet, as the messenger of Jehovah, dared to invade the inner portal of the palace and in the name of heaven denounce any act of injustice. Even the lion-hearted David quailed before Nathan as the unterrified seer portrayed the picture of a king seizing the inviolable goods of the poor. The insertion of such a parable in the literature of the people* made it morally impossible with impunity to ignore or fail to appreciate the rights of the humble or defenseless. The king's crime was enormously aggravated because it was committed against a foreigner who was loyal to his service. It has been said that the *patria potestas* of the Romans bears the image of a barbarous age.† It was exercised long after the benign principles of family life in Palestine had elevated youth, through various interesting stages, to the responsibilities of manhood. Edersheim‡ shows that there were not fewer than eight designations to tenderly mark the various periods in the life of a Jewish son. Rome, of course, had no such homogeneous population as that which formed the Hebrew State, and greater severity to the inferior classes may have been unavoidable. Nor was the enslavement of other races ever very extensive among the Israelites, for they were always restricted in their martial conquests and commercial relations. The former of these, indeed, would not

* Note, however, that the compiler of the Chronicles for some reason omits any account of this unflattering incident in David's history.

† John Lord, *The Old Roman World*, p. 237. Consult this work also for similar views on the evils of slavery and divorce, the severity of penal law, and other abuses. For an extensive description of the *patria potestas* and its relation to the State, see Maine, *Ancient Law*, pp. 130-165.

‡ *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i, pp. 221, 226, 227. The terms are יֵלֶד, *yēledh*, a newborn babe, as in Isa. ix, 6; יוֹנֵק, *yōneq*, the suckling, Isa. xl, 8; עוֹלֵל, *ōlel*, the nursing who teases for food, Lam. iv, 4; גַּמּוּל, *gamul*, the weaned child, Isa. xxviii, 9; תָּפַח, *taph* ("toddler"), the child clinging to its mother, Jer. xl, 7; עֵלֶם, *elēm*, a child becoming firm, used of the lad with Jonathan, 1 Sam. xx, 22; נָעַר, *na'ar*, lad, one who shakes himself free, Isa. vii, 16; בָּחֹר, *bahur*, the (chosen) ripened one, Isa. lxii, 5.

have supplied an atmosphere favorable to an ethical code which recognized the universal kinship of the human race and protected the meanest individual in the exercise of his natural rights, as sacred to God who made him.

There is a difference of opinion in regard to the treatment of the lower classes by the Egyptians. Pressensé * quotes from a papyrus now in the Louvre and from the *Book of the Dead* to prove that the Egyptians were very kind and merciful, at least in theory. Sir Gardner Wilkinson, in his work on *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, quoted by A. H. Sayce, † has pointed out that "the Egyptians, alone of ancient nations, considered an act of humanity worthy of record in stone." Geikie, ‡ however, represents the masters of the Nile as exceedingly oppressive in spirit. The people were treated as slaves by their kings and the higher castes. The construction of the pyramids and other public works necessitated a most degrading enslavement of multitudes. An inscription of the period says, "It is very hard to make the smooth road on which the colossus is to slide along; but how unspeakably harder to drag the huge mass, like beasts of burden." Slaves, at least, were driven with unremitting vigor; and if the sentiment of fraternity was entertained it was restricted in its practice to the ruling classes. The people were enfeoffed to the land and belonged to the Pharaohs. "There was, in fact, no 'people' in Egypt; only slaves." Ewald § is authority for the statement that the Egyptian culture must have ultimately repelled, rather than attracted, Moses. The Sinaitic legislation was designed to rebuke and counteract the system of religion and politics under which the children of Israel had suffered such injuries. This is proven in the issuance of the second commandment, as the deification of the brute creation had been carried to its extreme by the Egyptians. No doubt Moses was wiser from what he had learned in the midst of this greatest civilization then extant; but when he ordained a statute aimed toward the exercise of mercy he added that the law would commend itself to the people, as they remembered that they had been bondmen in Egypt. The recollection of that grievous

* *The Ancient World and Christianity*, pp. 81-84.

† *The Races of the Old Testament*, pp. 84, 85.

‡ *Hours with the Bible*, vol. II, pp. 65, 66, 77-79.

§ *History of Israel*, vol. II, p. 56.

servitude made it impossible for them ever to inflict similar hardships even on captives, much less on their brethren. Yet slaves have often been the hardest of masters.

The Old Testament code endowed the individual with hope, in vivid contrast with the despairing systems of India. Untold and indescribable miseries befall the children born near the Himalayas, so that the struggling millions are without heart, spirit, or ambition. No wonder that they have been so easily made subject to the British crown. Especially is the condition of the female sex unfortunate. The following prayer of a high caste woman who had spent her life from childhood as a "child-widow" is quoted in the *Encyclopædia of Missions*: *

O, Father of the world, hast thou not created us? Or has, perchance, some other god made us? Dost thou only care for men? Hast thou no thought for us women? Why hast thou created us male and female? O, Almighty One, hast thou not power to make us other than we are, that we, too, may have some part in the comforts of life? The cry of the oppressed is heard even in the world. Then canst thou look upon our victim hosts and shut the doors of thy justice? O God almighty and unapproachable, think upon thy mercy, which is a vast sea, and remember us. O Lord, save us, for we cannot bear our hard lot.

In lands nominally Christian it is still difficult to enact a systematic course of legislation that will protect the poor and friendless. Demagogues needing suffrages may construct platforms and utter impassioned addresses which profess to aim at the alleviation of distress; but we all have learned to our disappointment that, when they are elected, they yield complete subservience to the money power. If the minister of the Gospel appeals to the Bible standard for the making of laws he is positively informed that his plans are visionary and impracticable; but there would not be so many anarchic disturbances in this modern civilization of ours, which claims to be advanced, if the spirit of the Mosaic institutions was treated with more deference.

Whence originated such a system of beneficent laws? It would be absurd to deny that there was a good degree of humanity in the natural man who lived in the midst of Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, or Roman influences. The

* Art. "Hinduism."

Chaldeans were not devoid of the milk of human kindness, as the brief sketches in Genesis prove. It is not derogatory to the credit of Moses that he learned from the patriarchs and from Egypt and Midian. The Bible says that he did. We are wont to say that the instructions of the *Torah* came from God; but it does not follow that the founder of the Hebrew State did not acquire some of his legislative wisdom from the study of past history and of the actual condition of the neighboring nations. God had endowed these also with some faculties for government. Knowledge may be divinely granted when received secondhand, as well as when delivered through a supernatural medium. Information acquired in the ordinary way may be as much a part of God's truth as if it had been revealed amid the portents of Sinai. While much has been evolved from the immanence of God in the human soul there is a very valuable quantum that can be secured only by intellectual effort. What of good it may have pleased the Lord to make known unto the heathen was not despised in the composition of the inspired books. It is somewhat of an answer to those who tell us that Moses could not have produced such a code as that attributed to him in the wilderness to suggest that he "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians."* As well might it be said that it was impossible for the framers of the American Constitution to produce that instrument, which is the embodiment of the best national jurisprudence collected up to date. It is stated in so many words that the great lawgiver did accept the counsel of his father-in-law, Jethro, in matters referring to the dispensing of justice in the congregation. We can well wish to know more about the code in use among the Midianites, or rather, as it is suggested by Ewald, the Kenites, who were ever afterward so friendly to their kinsmen. But the skill of an architect must reach beyond the character of the material that may be used in the building.

Wines† makes the claim "that the scholars of other countries lighted their torch in Zion." He attributes the superiority of the Sinaitic covenant to the fact that Jehovah communed with his people. They were imbued with a humane and be-

* Comp. Warburton, *Divine Legation of Moses*, vol. ii, pp. 316, 317.

† *Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews*, p. 334.

nevolent spirit because the Lord walked among them. If the Romans were gifted with the power of organization and the Greeks with that of philosophical analysis, the Hebrews inherited the religious feeling which is considerate of frailty and removes its cause. In the study of comparative religions we observe that worship is largely separated from morals. Some of the most exhaustive treatises on the subject omit any reference to the faith and life of the devotees in the description of the various systems called religions. There is no such separation in Mosaism. Jehovah requires beneficence as preliminary to worship. All national prosperity is the fruit of the divine blessing. The welfare of the community depends on the happiness of its individual members. To this the Lord is committed. War and adversity will be inflicted if the poor are oppressed. Injustice is to be punished in this world. Warburton and others have shown that the doctrine of future retribution was held in abeyance, though it was advocated by the Egyptians. As yet there was too much danger of tyranny and its related iniquities if the wicked were not at once to receive ample deserts so that others might be restrained from their crimes. Well was it said, "What nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day" (Deut. iv, 8). This thought was inbred into the life of the people, so that they fully believed that the divine sanction was the spur of all their social intercourse.

It may seem to be a serious objection to the Old Testament order that it was not uniformly carried into effect. Jeremiah attributes the cause of the Babylonish captivity to a disregard of the sabbatical year. Even the Sabbath of days was grossly violated, and the feast of tabernacles had suffered total desuetude (Neh. viii, 17). Doubtless many of the requirements of the calendar and ritual were exceedingly embarrassing, inconvenient, and sometimes disastrous. The first Book of Maccabees (chap. ii, 32-41) relates that some of the Jews lost their lives rather than fight on the Sabbath day; but the survivors resolved that their enemies should never be allowed again to take such an advantage. It is difficult, indeed, to conceive how the sabbatical year could be literally observed; but the enactment would, at least, serve as a reminder that the share of the

impoverished in the product of the real estate must be duly recognized. A compromise in the way of some equivalent return for the interest in the crops of the seventh year would most likely be proposed, if necessary, for it is not at all probable that the poor and weak would endure violence or the spoiling of their goods without a cry for relief, such as was made to Elisha by the widow whose sons were about to be seized by her creditors.

Laws that depend on a religious sanction carry with them an important disciplinary purpose, though they may not be fully observed. They offer an ideal standard by which to cultivate the disposition of the subject, so that he may at least strive toward the mark of perfection. Such commands, when in advance of public opinion, are not demoralizing, as civil enactments, which are to be enforced by temporal penalties, are asserted by some to become when not vigorously executed. Indeed, God's moral order, if disobeyed, is invariably attended with the threatened consequences, whether men are or are not prepared for the doctrine. We do not think of banishing or abrogating the New Testament because the great majority of professing Christians live confessedly far below its inculcations. A few vigorously and sincerely endeavor to maintain the Bible standard of holiness and perfection; but new obligations arise with further study and appropriation of the truth. Christ, in the Sermon on the Mount, read new lessons in the sixth and seventh commandments. It is in the province of our text-books on ethical science to widen the application of the law to every contingency; but we may expect that God's thoughts will anticipate all our philosophy. In spite of there being so many sorry caricatures of Christianity, the Gospel has educated society until many reforms have been accomplished, such as the abolition of slavery, the settlement of international disputes by arbitration, the extension of suffrage, the placing of restrictions on child labor, better protection for the debtor class, and a milder prison discipline. Such benevolent bodies as the Society of Friends have never been discouraged because their numbers were few or their material resources insignificant. Their little leaven permeates the whole lump. Though the poor were oppressed and otherwise mistreated by the powerful in Israel and Judah, yet the Jews are now distinguished for their tender

and considerate interest in behalf of their weaker brethren. Eleemosynary art has achieved a higher state of progress among them than among the Gentiles. To the chosen people the law is *Torah*—instruction—and the patriot seeks no higher distinction than to be a rabbi or a disciple. His chief aim is to delight in the law; for he is a child of God, and the divine command is thankfully received as infallible advice.

In regard to humane efforts for the amelioration of society the Mosaic law is to be regarded as a schoolmaster. To a people thus prepared by generations of peculiar instruction the ministry of Christ was addressed. The Son of the carpenter was an appropriate outgrowth and divine embodiment of the Father's unremitting care for his little ones. Jesus owned no real estate. He often was hungry and weary. In youth he was subject unto his parents, living in an obscure hillside town, which would naturally suggest limited, if not straitened, circumstances. The country at this time apparently teemed with lepers, widows, the poor, blind, lame, deaf, dumb, epileptic, and demented, who instinctively discovered in him a friend. When he entered on his work he called attention to the benign prophecy (Isa. lxi, 1-3) which he declared would be fulfilled in him. By the announcement of his gracious works he expected John to be convinced and satisfied. The words of the Saviour are explicit. He enunciates a valuable truth, which ought now to be kept in mind, that "the Sabbath was made for man," especially for that class who are less fortunate than their fellows. He emphatically reiterates, what had been almost forgotten, "I will have mercy." He quails not in his bitter malediction of the scribes and Pharisees who "devour widows' houses" and "are full of extortion." He encourages the indigent to believe that they can do good, and commends a widow who asserts her right in the temple privilege by giving two mites. In the parable of the Good Samaritan he teaches how far the beneficent provisions of the second table are to extend; and in the account of the rich man and Lazarus he reminds his hearers that neglect of the poor is an express violation of the divine order as revealed in Moses and the prophets, who furnish all adequate sanction for a life well pleasing to God.

When Christ ascended his followers accepted the legacy which he had bequeathed to them in the house of Simon the

leper, "Ye have the poor with you always;" and they began the work of almsgiving by attempting to establish a system for the community of goods. It was soon proven that such an arrangement was faulty and liable to grievous abuse; yet they never failed to inculcate the obligation which they had sought to discharge in this way. It was the business of that most heroic spirit, Stephen, to whose martyrdom Paul's conviction was due, to see that the Hellenist widows were not neglected in the daily ministration. James, in his preeminently Jewish epistle, warned the rich against their covetousness and extortion. A new dispensation has not changed the policy of the Lord of Sabaoth in behalf of the reapers whose cries have entered heaven (James v, 4). Pure religion consists still in visiting "the fatherless and widows in their affliction." In the first general council of the New Testament Church a specific canon was adopted and approved, that the more prosperous Gentile Christians should "remember the poor" (Gal. ii, 10); and Paul commended his apostolate in that he "also was forward to do" the same. On such an errand he visited Jerusalem, on which occasion he was arrested and afterward providentially conveyed to Rome. In his earlier epistles and in the Acts of the Apostles great prominence is given to this general and continued movement to assist the poor saints. In the last books of the New Testament the precedent is recognized as leading to a principle that was to be universal in its application (1 Tim. vi, 17-19). This Christian spirit is gracefully illustrated in the classic letter to Philemon, who is advised to receive his regenerated bondman Onesimus as a "brother beloved." The law of kindness was an integral element in the woof of original Christianity, and its present manifestation in so many various forms is but the interweaving of beautiful figures that form component parts of the entire fabric.

Modern statesmen and philanthropists will do well to develop the primary purpose of the Hebrew legislation, which seems to have anticipated the social reforms that now agitate the public mind. Many eleemosynary institutions have been properly relegated to support and control by the civil power, which, though nonsectarian in operation, should be religious in principle. No Christian would demur to bearing his share in the maintenance of insane hospitals and similar asylums. But the body politic is

too often administered under the direction of trusts, corporations, and millionaires, who give the poor man but little opportunity. The liquor saloon, an enemy of labor, home, and good feeling, is still the dominant power in politics, and but little effort is made to suppress it, on the wearisome pretense that laws of this kind cannot be executed. Thus, pauperism is propagated and capital is endangered, as class is arrayed against class through a disregard of the law of love. Materialism of the grossest kind is the basis of much of our social philosophy. The Malthusian theory of population is gaining in popularity, though there seems to be no immediate occasion to dread the awful consequences predicted. Among the Jews, who have ever been so tender toward the waifs of humanity, the national theology taught the truth that "a man's a man for a' that."

It may be customary to cry down anything Hebrew as narrow, offensive, and bigoted; but it yet remains that the votaries of Mosaism have thriven under adverse criticism and unremitting persecution. Christians have been furnished with one of the strongest arguments for the intrinsic value of their own faith in the continued existence and prosperity of the Jews. Once, it was thought that the laws enacted to teach men to love their neighbors as themselves were limited in their scope to a single nation that claimed to be holy and to a race who were content to be a peculiar people. But at the advent of Jesus a new era dawned, and by the preaching of the Gospel peace and good-will * were proclaimed to all mankind. Mosaism was a conservatory for the cultivation of young shoots and rare plants, that might afterward bloom and bear fruit throughout the whole earth.

* Some good authorities prefer the rendering of the Authorized to that of the Revised Version.

John Poucher

ART. IV.—THE CONFERENCE COURSE OF STUDY.

BY Conference Course of Study, as every Methodist preacher knows, is meant the course of study prescribed in the Discipline for traveling preachers and for local preachers applying for ordination. In the earlier days of Methodism, before the era of Methodist colleges and seminaries, this "course of study" was the only curriculum pursued by well-nigh all Methodist preachers; and even in this day, with all our vaunted educational facilities, large numbers of our ministers graduate at no other theological school. The day may come when no man will be sent out as pastor of a Methodist society who has not received a collegiate or seminary education, or both; but that day is not yet. Whether we like it or not, the fact remains that God still calls men to preach the Gospel who are neither college nor seminary graduates; and they come knocking at the doors of our Conferences and praying for admission on the grounds of that call. Some are young and can wait for college and seminary training. All who possibly can are urged to step aside for such special preparation. But some cannot turn aside for this purpose. Shall they all be denied admission? The Methodist Church has been in the habit of saying: "If they know they have been converted; if they know, and the Church believes, they have been called of God to preach the Gospel; if they are pure in life and sound in doctrine; if they have native ability and a good elementary English education as a mental foundation; if there is room for them and places that need them, admit them on trial. Let them begin to preach. Put them in the front of the fight, and let them drill afterward." That was what the Conference Course of Study was meant to be—a mental drill for a working Methodist preacher.

It is stating a truism, patent to every practical educator in the Church, to say that this course of study has not accomplished all that might reasonably be expected of it. Where shall the blame be laid? Is it because the course laid down in the Discipline is not the best possible for accomplishing the results desired? It seems hardly proper even to hint at such a thing, when this course has been selected by our honored board of bishops and comes with the seal of their approval fresh upon

it. Are the undergraduate ministers themselves to blame? In part; for if they mastered the books, in any true sense, the desired end would be attained. Yet many do not master the books. Why not? Is the fault with the committees on examination? In part; for committees have been known to pass candidates upon a very superficial examination.

Yet we must not lay all the blame on undergraduates and examiners. Has not indolence in examined and carelessness in examiner been encouraged, if not engendered, by an unwise method, or lack of method, in planning for examiners and examinations? There is danger in having any officer in Church or State who is not amenable to some higher power for his official conduct; and our Conference committees, as a rule, have been just such officers. Each examiner has been a law unto himself, a free lance, an Ishmaelite. Appointed, frequently, for no special qualification for such service; continued at the caprice of his presiding elder; dropped, at the end of his first, fifth, or tenth year, with or without cause, as might best suit the whims or plans of the power that appointed him; not required to conduct his work according to any system or plan; amenable to no man or set of men for the fidelity and wisdom with which he executed his work; with no praise offered for good work done, no censure for grossest negligence of his sacred trust; with no standard set before him as the ideal method of performing his delicate and important task; with no incentive for him to do his best, neither as appealing to his ambition by a hope of reward, nor yet to his fear of condemnation in case of failure—no wonder, with such a lawless, chaotic system (?) behind him, that an examiner should grow careless, neglect preparation for his examination, and then on facing his class should say, "Well, brethren, I guess you have all studied the books." "Yes, sir." "That is right. And I have no doubt you know just as much about them as I do. But it is my duty to ask you a few questions."

So a few meaningless questions are asked from a hurried glance at the "table of contents;" the examiner expresses his satisfaction at their evident proficiency; all the class pass with high marks, which mean nothing; and every intelligent student, as he leaves that room, hangs his head in shame at such a farce of an examination, which passes men indiscrimi-

nately, whether they have studied or not. His soul is shocked, his mind dazed, as he wanders off to himself to ponder this recent revelation: "And is the door to the ministry of the great Methodist Episcopal Church so carelessly guarded—the Church of my choice, the Church of my love, for whose ministry I have such high regard that I have laid aside all other prospects and ambitions and have devoted ten years of my youth and early manhood in preparation for its holy work—and yet is it of such little value that one need only know the silly schoolboy questions asked us by that popular minister in order to be admitted into the charmed circle? Surely, to be a minister of our Church means far less than I had supposed. The loosest examination I ever had in public or high school, in college or seminary, was strictness incarnate compared with that I have just passed. Does it really require less brains and culture to be a minister of the Gospel than to be a teacher in the public school or a freshman at college?"

The workings of the old system of appointing examiners and conducting examinations, as seen in an experience of several years in the Wilmington Conference as examined and examiner, suggest five objections to the method:

FIRST OBJECTION: CHANGING OF EXAMINERS.

If "practice makes perfect" in other things, why not in examinations? No man is as well prepared to examine at the first reading of a book as at the tenth reading. Nor is it possible for any examiner to tell beforehand just how a question will strike the mind of a student. A wise examiner strives to so frame a question that its meaning shall be perfectly plain. All ambiguity must be excluded. Yet, with the utmost care, a question that seems perfectly clear to the examiner may not prove univocal to the examined. One question given to a class last year, that to the examiner's mind could mean only one thing, was misunderstood by every member of the class. Hence we concluded that it was an unfair question and one not to be asked again in that form. Improvement in examinations can only take place by continuing one man on the same books. Colleges act wisely in this matter. By continuing a man year after year in one department he becomes a master of that department, better able both to teach and examine every time he

restudies his course. Who would care to attend a college where the professor changed departments every year—taught Latin this year, Greek next, mathematics the third, science the fourth, and then was dismissed and an entirely new man put in his place? Yet the latter has been our Conference method—constant changing, either by putting in new men outright or by moving forward the examiner with the class. No man has had a chance to examine two years in succession on the same book. This is most unwise, as anyone can see.

Remedy: A permanent board of examiners, who shall continue to examine in the same studies year after year. See Rule 1, below.

As a corollary to objection one, rather than as a separate objection, comes the unwisdom of having separate examining committees for each year's class. Changing examiners and separate committees for each year stand or fall together; the condemnation of the one is the death sentence of the other. Why should it be deemed necessary to have two men engaged in examining candidates on Harman's *Introduction* at the same time, because some candidates are in the second and some in the third year? Should not the very fact that they had faced an examiner in the second year on the first half of the book and learned his style of examination be the strongest argument in favor of their appearing in the third year before the same man for examination on the last half? Why should two examiners be necessary on United States history, or Methodist history, or grammar, or the Discipline, or on books on other subjects which are identical in the two courses, simply because in one the candidate is being examined as a traveling, in the other as a local, preacher? Are history, grammar, and the Discipline different because studied by men seeking these different relations? Does not wisdom say, "One examiner for both?" Is it not far wiser to have certain examiners for certain books and to let them examine all those who are to be examined on these books, whether traveling or local, whether first or second or third or fourth year preachers?

Remedy: Divide the entire courses of study for traveling and local preachers into departments. Place a wise, progressive educator in charge of each department and keep him there. See Rule 2.

SECOND OBJECTION: METHOD OF APPOINTING EXAMINERS.

The old method has been for the bishop to appoint the examiners, which means that the presiding elders practically appoint them. Perhaps no set of men in the Conference know so well, in a general way, the abilities and capabilities of the ministers of the whole Conference as do the presiding elders. Perhaps no committee that could be appointed by the chair or the Conference would be likely to nominate examiners so intelligently as the presiding elders. So, if the old system is to be continued, by all means let them be appointed as heretofore. But if we elect and organize a board of examiners, as contemplated in Rule 1, we have a body of men far better qualified to judge of the fitness of a man on the examining board than the presiding elders can possibly be. The presiding elder knows Brother M. N. as a college graduate and a fine preacher, thinks that of course he will make a good examiner, and appoints him on general principles. But because a brother has pulpit ability of a certain sort and writes A.B., A.M., or even D.D. after his name is not demonstrative evidence that he is a good examiner, that is, that he knows how to ask fair, clean-cut questions that mean something and has judgment enough to weigh the worth of an answer. Let that same M. N. meet with his fellow-examiners for a year. Let them read or hear the questions he gives, examine the answers received and the marks given, see how the class succeeds with him, and then they will be more competent than any outsider can possibly be to say whether he should be continued. For unwise nominations there is a

Remedy: Let the board of examiners nominate, and the Conference elect, all examiners. See Rules 1 and 2.

THIRD OBJECTION: METHOD OF CONDUCTING THE EXAMINATIONS.

Examinations are usually oral, written, or partly oral and partly written. As usually conducted, all three methods are unfair. Take the oral method. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, and J are ten students to be examined by K. K has carefully prepared one hundred questions, which will be ten for each man, and has decided to give a mark of one for each question correctly answered, ten being a perfect mark. He begins. Question 1 is asked of A, and, it being an easy question, A an-

swers promptly and correctly and one is set down to his credit. Question 2 is difficult, and B and C fail on it, while D answers it and gets a credit of one. Question 3 is easy, and E answers it; but 4 is difficult, and, F, G, H, and I missing it, J answers it, and receives his credit of one. So it goes until the hundred questions are exhausted. It is found each man has answered ten questions; and according to his plan K gives each man ten and congratulates himself on his skill and his fairness to all the men. Has he been fair? Not at all. A, B, C, E, F, G, H, and I have missed every difficult question, leaving them to be answered by D and J, while D and J have not had an easy question during the examination, but have been kept busy answering the difficult questions which the other eight could not answer. Is it fair to D and J, the two hard, faithful students of the class, to give them the same mark for answering ten difficult questions that the other eight receive for answering ten easy ones?

Let us take the written or the partly written and partly oral examinations. Again we have one hundred prepared questions, arranged in series of 1-10, 11-20, 21-30, etc.; and these being placed on the table the class is allowed to draw. Is this fair? No; it is even more unfair than the oral method given above. No matter whether the answers are all to be written, or five are to be written and five oral, the result is the same; it is unfair. A, E, and H draw 11-20, 51-60, and 71-80 respectively; and these being the most interesting parts of the book, as well as the easiest to remember, A, E, and H happen to know these parts and, although the poorest students in the class, get ten each. But D and J, the two brightest and best students in the class, happen to draw 21-30, and 61-70, the least interesting and least important sections in the book and, therefore, the most difficult to commit—in fact, such parts as a wise student would not try to commit; and they get six each. Is it fair that success in passing one's examination should depend, not so much upon careful study, as upon his "luck" in drawing the right slip?

Remedy: Let all examinations be in writing. Let the same identical questions be asked of every student. Let there be a large number of questions on isolated facts of importance scattered through the entire book, to test the memory and

prove that the entire book has been studied. Let there be a few general questions, broad in scope, to test the reasoning, analytic, and synthetic powers of the mind. Then the examination will be a real and fair test. See Rule 5.

FOURTH OBJECTION: THE ONE ANNUAL EXAMINATION.

Our objection to the one annual examination is on two grounds: 1. A Methodist preacher is too busy in the last three months of the Conference year, the preaching of two sermons every Sabbath—no small strain on a young man—the making of delayed pastoral visits, the correcting of pastoral and church records, the hunting up of the all-important benevolent collections leaving little time or energy for other work. To ask a man under such a burden of dissimilar duties to review the studies of a whole year and prepare for a strict examination on the whole year's study is outrageously unfair. No school or college in the country of which we have knowledge makes any such demands upon its students, although these have nothing else to do but study. 2. It prevents that intercourse between examiner and examined which is so much to be desired. Under the old system examiner and examined study independently, and neither has an idea of how the other sees a book until they meet in the examination room. Of course, the difference in mental bias makes the book quite unlike for the two men. Examiner has seen 7, 13, 16, 27, 33 as the principal truths and prepared his examination upon those points; but Examined has seen 4, 12, 16, 20, 28 as the principal truths and is prepared to pass a perfect examination from his view-point of the book. Ought not some plan to be devised so that the examined shall know the views of the examiner upon the book before he is compelled to face his list of questions?

Remedy: Let there be a mid-year meeting at some central place of all examiners and examined, at which a part of the course shall be completed and passed upon, and at which the examiner shall tell the class what he sees in the books of his department. See Rule 4.

FIFTH OBJECTION: THE PERSONAL EQUATION.

We are all wonderfully human and are more controlled by prejudice than we care to confess or are even aware of. This

weakness of humanity causes trouble in examinations, even among ministers. A is known as an especial pet of K's. He was converted during K's pastorate. He was licensed while K was presiding elder. Now K is on the examining committee, and A comes up for admission. K would not be human if, under such circumstances, he did not give A as high a mark as he consistently could; and A's examination being really first-class he gladly gives him a perfect mark, ten. But B is in that same class. He, too, is an old acquaintance of K's, but not on such friendly terms as A. B's father led the anti-K faction in the church at the same time that A's father led the K faction. A, hearing his father say so many good things of the pastor, was bound to him, then led to Christ; but B, hearing nothing but abuse of K, learned to hate him and was a great annoyance during K's entire pastorate. Now K will not be human if, under such circumstances, he gives B any more than he fully merits; and as his examination is very imperfect he feels he is fully justified in marking "three" after B's name. Will not some of B's friends now be tempted to say, "K is prejudiced and gives ten to A because he likes him, and three to poor B because he dislikes him?" How shall we get rid of this personal equation—the temptation to mark according to our feelings and the temptation to slander an honest man for doing his duty?

Remedy: Have all examinations signed in pseudonym and sent to the secretary of the board before going into the hands of the examiner. See Rule 6.

These are the five great objections to the old system, as we see it, and their remedies. Are not these suggestions practical? Only two objections have been offered to the proposed plan: 1. That the board of examiners may develop into a clique that will give trouble; 2. The cost of arranging for and attending this mid-year meeting. To the first of these we reply that the danger is only imaginary. The board only nominates; the Conference must elect. Then, too, twice as many nominees must be presented as there are vacancies to fill. See Rule 10. But even without this precaution is there any more danger that such board will form a clique to run the Conference than that the presiding elders will do the same thing? As to the second, that of cost, the question was solved for us of the Wilmington Conference by the trustees of our Conference Academy, at

Dover, Del., a beautiful town, centrally located, and permeated with Methodism. These trustees very kindly extended to us the broadest and most cordial invitation to hold our mid-year meeting as their guests and to stay as long as was necessary. This grants us, not only bed and board for all examiners and examined, but full use of their magnificent recitation rooms and assembly hall. We accepted the invitation and held our first meeting there in June last with great success. We pooled our traveling expenses, which averaged us just \$1.28; and our five days' board saved at home fully paid this amount. Other Conferences having Church schools or colleges within their borders could doubtless make similar arrangements.

We of the Wilmington Conference believe these plans to be a step in the direction of progress. By a unanimous vote at its last session the rules which are given below were adopted. The board met and with equal unanimity adopted the scheme of studies hereto appended. It is not claimed that the plans here presented are the very best that can be evolved; but we are striving for an ideal plan. Until we are shown a "more excellent way" we will hold to our own, praying the great Head of the Church to use it to build up more symmetrical and better furnished workmen than those of us who entered under the old *régime*.

RULES FOR THE ELECTION, AND DUTIES, OF THE WILMINGTON CONFERENCE BOARD OF EXAMINERS.

1. The board of examiners shall consist of sixteen elders, who at the first shall be nominated by the presiding elders and elected by this Conference, and shall serve for a term of years as follows: four for one year, four for two years, four for three years, four for four years. After the election of the first board all nominations shall be by the board, and four members of the board shall be elected annually by this Conference to serve a term of four years, or until their successors have been elected. Vacancies occurring in the interim of the Conference shall be filled until Conference by the board.

2. Immediately after their election the board shall organize and elect a president and a secretary, and divide the entire course of study prescribed in the Discipline for traveling and local preachers into fifteen parts, and assign one department to each of their number except the secretary.

3. The secretary shall keep a record of all meetings of the board, a roster of all the undergraduate ministers belonging to the Conference, both traveling and local, be the means of communication between the examiners and the undergraduates, and keep a record of the examination of each student.

4. The board shall hold two stated meetings annually, namely, one in the month of June at the Wilmington Conference Academy, and the other on Monday and Tuesday preceding the session of the Conference at the seat of the Conference. The June meetings shall be in the nature of a ministerial retreat or summer school of theology, for instruction, for counsel, for meditation, and for the semiannual examinations. The annual meetings shall be for consultation, final work of examinations, such business as may be necessary, and outlining work for the coming year. The number of sessions at these stated meetings, with plans of work for each session, shall be arranged and published at least two weeks previous to such meeting, by a committee consisting of the president, secretary, and one appointed by the president at the previous stated meeting.

5. All examinations shall be in writing, both questions and answers. The examination on each book shall consist of not less than fifty, nor more than one hundred, questions of the catechetical order, requiring short, specific answers; and not less than five, nor more than ten, general questions, broad in their scope, so as to give an idea of the real learning of the student and his mental grasp. The examinations shall be marked on the scale of one hundred, the combined catechetical questions counting fifty, and the combined general questions counting fifty; and a mark of thirty in each set of questions and sixty on the whole examination shall be necessary to pass the candidate.

6. All answers to examination questions shall be forwarded to the secretary, signed with a pseudonym or number, accompanied by a sealed envelope containing the name and address of the student and marked on the outside with a number or pseudonym corresponding to that signed to the examination paper. The secretary shall promptly forward the paper containing the answers to the examiner in that department, who shall carefully examine the paper, mark plainly upon it the mark he judges it to merit on the scale given above, and return the

paper to the secretary for enrollment. The secretary shall then enter upon his register the mark given, and return the paper to the student. The examiner shall also keep a record of the mark given each paper.

7. The board of examiners shall have authority to make such subsidiary rules as may be necessary to carry out this order of the Conference, provided that such subsidiary rules shall not conflict with these nor with the Discipline of the Church.

8. The entire scheme of studies, with names of examiners, shall be published in the Minutes.

9. "Elementary English branches" shall be construed to embrace spelling, reading, English grammar, common school geography, and written arithmetic.

10. In nominating to fill vacancies twice as many names shall be presented to the Conference as there are vacancies to fill, the vote to elect being by ballot.

The Conference Courses of Study are divided into the following departments: 1. English. 2. History. 3. Belles Lettres. 4. Mental Science. 5. Apologetics. 6. Methodist Polity. 7. Methodist History. 8. Theological Encyclopedia. 9. Historical Theology. 10. Biblical Theology. 11. Exegetical Theology. 12. Systematic Theology. 13. Doctrinal Theology. 14. Homiletical Theology. 15. Practical Theology.

Vaughan S. Collins.

ART. V.—PRESS, PULPIT, AND PEW.

RIGHTLY related, properly understood, and thoroughly consecrated, nothing could withstand this trinity of forces in regenerating the world. A discussion of such a theme is timely. With most important problems, involving the weal or woe of humanity, awaiting solution, never was there more need for "the arousements." With this mightiest triple agency at our command, God awaits a more complete application of right principles to all the varied relationships of life and demands such an answer to these vital questions of the day as shall mark a more rapid advancement toward the highest moral civilization. Without this application and verdict by the millions who are daily making momentous decisions and meeting new relations, there surely await us social convulsions and civil and religious strifes such as the world has never seen. An all but omnipotent power for good within our reach, yet with the possibilities of the greatest evil, brings a weight of responsibility that we will do well to consider and try to understand.

The propensity, evidently God-given, to put in permanent form life's history and its lessons, and to communicate thought for the benefit or interest of others by means of the written page, is significantly voiced by Job: "Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever!" and indicates a power for molding opinion, shaping character, quickening intellect, and penetrating life that cannot be overestimated. No doubt man began very early this register of his thought and history; but it has remained for the citizen of the nineteenth century to have past treasure and present wealth of heart and intellect laid at his feet by the printed page of book and periodical, even as the north wind blows thither the autumn leaves. Job's "iron pen and lead" have been modernized; and appealing, as they do, to common sense, higher instincts, varied interests, material and spiritual, or ministering to the depraved tastes, bad habits, and base passions of the vast multitude, no power of the present day is comparable with them.

The chief reading of our time is the newspaper, including in this term the periodical of every kind, and the novel. The

newspaper has become an absolute necessity. Men must have it, the busiest making time to read it, not only for the news, but for direction in thought and opinion. Edited minds are now quite common, the paper regularly read indicating their position on any living issue. The best writing is done for the periodical; and our foremost men in thought and intellect are found entertaining, instructing, narrating, reasoning in our broad sheets. Modern journalism, with its mechanical skill, keen enterprise, and intellectual ability, is something almost miraculous in its achievement. Thackeray compares it to "the great engine that never sleeps in bringing to every man some portion of the world in which he is most interested." Holland describes it as "raking the entire globe clean every day of incident, movement, and event; while no cost of toil or gold dismays it;" and Lamartine declares that soon "thought will not have time to accommodate itself to the form of a book; the only book possible will be a newspaper." Anyway, it stands as the historian of our daily life, while forming public opinion, influencing legislation, dictating politics, changing dominant parties, and, whether it be the daily, weekly, monthly, or quarterly issue, representing the institutions, philosophies, literatures, foibles, and habits of men the world over.

Scarcely less influential is the modern novel, defined as prose narrative fiction and produced in such vast and overwhelming quantities that it would be a hopeless task to make anything like a complete catalogue. A nation's literature should be rich in historical records, scientific data, philosophical research, and the choicest thoughts and principles of mighty souls; but it may properly clothe the ever-instructive story of life in the costume of fiction and thus minister to one of the noblest faculties of the human mind. We dare not write a wholesale condemnation of the novel. Its power to impart many of life's most important lessons cannot be questioned. The story-writer will never lack readers; and so long as the ideal world thus created reveals life just as men live it, warning us by impressive recitals and inspiring to noble purposes by lofty examples, we cannot deny it a high place in the general culture of humanity and in the uplifting of the world. But when this fictitious writing is, much of it, worldly, profane, frivolous, impure, sensual, pen cannot describe the awful results; and yet

for this kind there is an immense demand. To stand in the post office when the mail arrives, to spend an hour in a circulating library, to call at the retail counter of book and department stores, or to visit many a publishing house as the stream of "yellow-covered literature," to say nothing of the blue and gold, sheep and morocco, issues therefrom, would convince the most skeptical that the rage for such fiction is beyond all precedent. Designing, unworthy authors, realistic caterers to a morbid appetite, or ignorant scribblers of insipid, unmeaning, if not corrupting, novels are becoming the teachers of more than half the present generation. Acknowledging the vast influence of periodical and novel in effecting the world's weal, criticism cannot be too severe, invective too keen, or anxiety too intense in view of their perversion and moral delinquencies. A classification of these combined publications will present the evil of a demoralizing press more forcibly.

1. *The unwholesome and polluting.* In this class are grouped the following: 1. The obscene, sold on the sly and secretly read in schools, stores, shops, and homes, to leave a stain upon the soul that bitter tears cannot wash out or deepest repentance fully remove. 2. The infidel, openly avowed or, more often, dangerously disguised and coming in its worst form as a fascinating novel, an ably edited newspaper, or popular lecture. Written to undermine Christianity, frequently the product of cultivated intellect or, at least, of a certain smartness that is taking, and scattered broadcast in our cities and towns, especially in the mills, workshops, and factories, it is no wonder that spiritual indifference supervenes or that the heart loses what has been termed "its best jewel—faith in revealed religion." 3. The sensational illustrated, of large size, often printed on tinted paper, and giving in detail the grossest forms of crime, accompanied by pictures that ought never to meet the public eye, or presenting with coarse pictorial embellishments a fiction that must be suggestive of the foulest thoughts and that is destructive of every moral sensibility. An illustrated paper of the grade of *Harper's Weekly* is a most efficient agency in educating and molding the youthful mind; but these papers, exceeding in vileness all conception, flood our news-stands, and their indecent pictures are studied and their detestable trash read by young people all over the land, until

the moral turpitude of crime and immorality is entirely lost sight of and the dear ones of our homes are prepared to make a rapid descent of the broad path to ruin. This group would not be complete without including some of our best papers from the news standpoint, wherein, by sensational headings and startling, realistic descriptions, appeals are being constantly made to the prurient curiosity and baser passions of our being. Why should our great dailies become so largely "sewers of current filth," with every detail of wickedness so vividly reproduced that crime is exalted and increased by the very notoriety given? A morbid sympathy is created, criminals are flattered, the young are tempted to follow in their footsteps, and an irreparable injury is done to society by papers that, otherwise, inform, instruct, and entertain. Hugh Price Hughes, in one of his addresses while in this country, said, "I tell them in my church that, if they see a duke coming, they are to treat him with all due respect; but if they see a reporter, they must treat him with awed reverence"—a touch of sarcasm, perhaps, but wise enough advice from the proper standpoint. There are, however, conditions, far too common, which render it quite otherwise. The partisanship that will blacken and destroy the character of public men merely for political advantage, the unfeeling and often exaggerated descriptions of the sorrow, unhappiness, and shame of the erring and unfortunate, the banquets of butchery, blood, and scandal served up to create, in order that they may feed, a morbid appetite for sensational items should speedily change the "awed reverence" into that honest indignation which would demand the suppression of these carrion hunters and place the ban of society upon the journal that dares to publish and scatter broadcast such material. These publications, constantly going out among the masses, must necessarily compel to a process of education resulting in carnivals of sensuality and the utter demoralization of society. It is sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind.

II. *The latitudinarian.* This class, largely novels and romances, have not the open grossness, depravity, or sensationalism of the other; yet these qualities are not absent. Arrayed in the garb of decency, sugar-coated with polished periods and graceful imagery, they are, perhaps, all the more dangerous. It is the "charming, sentimental dallying with

sin," as Miss Muloch calls it, "which makes it appear so piteous, so interesting, and so beautiful," and which leads the reader into such close and dangerous sympathy with the most immoral characters. There is no censure of infidelity to home, of heart-adultery, of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, or the pride of life, but, rather, such commendation as must obliterate all moral distinctions in the minds of those who read. If it is asked, "Are not these books and papers brilliant? do they not sparkle and delight?" Professor Porter gives the complete answer:

Yes, brilliant, as a rotten log or a putrescent carcass, which shine because they are decayed, and are phosphorescent just in proportion as they are offensive; and sparkling, just as the will-o'-the-wisp, which is created of foul gases and leads the silly pursuer through brush and brier, till it lands him in some miry swamp or chokes him with the damps of death.

III. The third and largest class, if it cannot eliminate, distorts, ridicules, or ignores the religious element as the basis of national prosperity and individual nobleness of character. From hundreds of our influential journals you could scarce infer that there was any such a thing as Christianity. Human nature is exalted, and men are to be made moral and the world better irrespective of the great essential doctrines of the Gospel. We do not ask that literature be sermonized or books and periodicals filled with the terminology of religion. But as Christianity claims to be the great regenerating force of the world, appealing to its own principles and to what it has done for communities and individuals to substantiate the claim, and as it answers to the religious element implanted within us, becoming the motive to high-toned principle and nobility of life, why should authors and editors ridicule and ignore it? That noble men and women, writing books and articles in finest classical English, should fail to recognize, if they do not caricature, that which beyond all else stimulates the literary propensity, furnishes the loftiest ideals of character, and inspires to the most exalted virtues, is something which is beyond explanation or even comprehension.

Three standard and almost universally read authors will illustrate the point here made. For purity and loftiness of moral tone George Eliot's works are scarcely excelled; but how strangely silent and negative her pages are upon the relation of

religion to human life and character! If her characters are self-denying and self-sacrificing it is without the aid of the supernatural. Faith in the "unseen and eternal" plays no part in making them strong in temptation, noble in action, or patient in suffering; and Dr. Dewart's criticism is just, that "her aim is to make the flowers and fruits of purity, nobleness, and truth grow from the wintry soil of earth, without the quickening beams of the Sun of righteousness." The favorite creations of Dickens are villains. The noble man and the ideal woman are scarcely ever portrayed upon his pages. If they are, religion gets no credit for the development of such characters. Purity and love are more often personified in the ridiculous blunderer, and religion in the contemptible fool. His purpose, no doubt, was to write down and out the evils of the social and educational England of his day. Nevertheless, he missed the grand opportunity of adding, for the benefit of a world-wide reading public, "one character to that lofty rank where dwell the best of humanity, or creating one character so close to us, yet so much above us, that we can feel him a positive gain to humanity." The otherwise admirably drawn characters of Walter Scott have this defect, that the foibles and imperfections of human life appear necessary to happiness and success, while the master hand that has outlined the life and virtues of a Jeanie Deans seems to have entirely put aside, except occasionally for the purpose of distortion and ridicule, the sturdy religious characteristics of the national life of Scotland. The high morality and lofty principles which abound upon his pages are not traced to their true source. Why should our best novelists so often leave the reader to do this for them, knowing, as they must, that by the vast majority it will never be done? There can be no objection to the faithful portrayal and severe condemnation of hypocrisy, fanaticism, and narrow-minded sectarianism; but surely it is not incompatible with the highest province of fiction to carry the reader at the same time up to the true and essential, and to complete the picture by adding the bright-colored rays, that can only emanate from one source, as an offset to the dark and somber background. At any rate, our author seems to have had little moral or religious aim, thereby leading a Wilberforce to say, "I would rather go to render my account at the last day carrying up with me the *Shepherd of Salisbury Plain* than

bearing the load of all these volumes [the *Waverley Novels*], full as they are of genius."

I would not deprive our young people of the instruction and recreation that these and kindred authors afford. But it should not be an unwarmed perusal, lest along with the entertainment they acquire the conviction that self-culture is sufficient for the attainment of our wishes, that true happiness does not depend upon religion, and that by overcoming obstacles to present success the future can be left to take care of itself. These three authors have been selected as representative of a mass of modern fiction, healthy and clean in itself and worthy of careful, but, in view of the objection noted, discriminating, study for style, diction, information, and pleasure. The value, power, and beneficence of the ideal newspaper and periodical have been acknowledged, while lamenting the tendency in certain quarters to mar that ideal by sending into our best homes journals with sensational headings and double-leaded columns filled with sensational and criminal details, under the plea that they are "news" and must be printed. With the honorable exceptions before mentioned, the classes described above constitute evil's mightiest agency; and Comstock's description is not too strong:

Mingled with realism, sensationalism, licentiousness, and criminal details, are infidel lectures, scoffings at reformatory movements, caustic flings at religion, blasphemy of God's name, sarcastic assaults upon divine institutions, and exultations over the temptation and downfall of good men, . . . the printing press thus grinding the grist of hell for the tolls and rewards of the devil.

The battle is on, and it must be to the finish; for home and youthhood, State and liberty, Church and purity, heaven and immortal souls are in the balance. We do not need new weapons of warfare. Already there is available a force adequate to the overthrow of this giant evil.

1. Elevate the press itself to a higher moral standard. Wield it more effectually upon the side of righteousness. Use its mighty power to more thoroughly counteract the very evil it is now producing and perpetuating. True, there are many instances where the power is exercised for the noblest purposes, and where the manly tone, the pure sentiment, the fearlessness and ability employed in exposing and reproving the follies and

errors of modern society are all that can be desired. Still, it is none the less true that a large, if not the larger, portion of to-day's literature is not distinctly on the side of righteousness. How to elevate the standard of a periodical literature now furtively depreciating or coldly aloof, how to crowd out "dime novel" trash and supplant pernicious publications by a better sort at the same price, how to bring acceptable and at the same time wholesome and elevated reading within the reach of the masses, is yet to be fully wrought out. The popular mind has been accustomed to the dangerous romance or the too liberal periodical, and it is a mistake to offer thereto purely religious publications in the form of tracts, biographies, and doctrinal discussions. The influences for evil come from entertaining literature of a depraved kind. The counteractive must be in an entertaining literature, comprising the standard works of the very best authors, furnished as cheaply as the ten or twenty cent novel and the cheap periodical, discussing the engrossing topics of the day, comprehending every branch of knowledge, occupying every department of letters, and yet edited in a truly religious, God-fearing spirit.

This is a wonderful mine for the Church to work, and especially the great Methodist Episcopal Church, through her book concerns and agents and her resources of talent and wealth. There is no organization on the face of the earth better fitted by her polity to scatter, like the falling leaves, the best works of the day at the lowest price. If this be done there will dawn a new era of power, influence, and successful effort for God's glory. Her family of *Advocates* and other periodicals, already nobly serving an immense constituency, should have their readers multiplied tenfold by bringing their cost within the means of the humblest toiler and, at the same time, broadening the mission for rich and poor alike, by giving a weekly (why not daily?) epitome of information on every subject, and by discussing more fully the discoveries, inventions, philosophies, controversies, living issues of the day, as is done by the secular press and in social, business, and even political circles, but leavened throughout by the principles of Christian truth.

What a small proportion, after all, do Christian men and women furnish of the reading demanded by the masses! Arnold once said, "I never wanted articles on religious sub-

jects half so much as articles on common subjects written with a decidedly Christian tone." Sanctified intellect ought to be more productive along this line. Men and women of wealth ought to spend more money, and the Church itself ought to encourage and remunerate her editors, authors, and concerns, pushing to the widest extent possible their publications and supporting heartily their plans to instruct and entertain those who are so soon to take control of the world and all its interests. King or president is not comparable in honor with him who was the originator of the Chautauquan idea. Eternity alone can measure its wonderful power in elevating the people by developing a taste for good and solid reading. The educational advantages of the Epworth League should be more fully recognized, and unlimited means be used to bring its literary department to the highest excellence and usefulness.

In reference to the secular press there are hopeful signs. Already this article has hinted at the tendency to make vice and crime familiar, if not seductive, by lengthy details and ornate descriptions. It may be necessary to mention as items of news and as deserving of popular hatred villainies, divorce proceedings, and prize fights; but to make them chief features of a great daily, to the exclusion of a fuller presentation of social reforms, of eventful gatherings, and of that cause in which is bound up the happiness and prosperity of nations—in fact, of everything that is for the education and development of the nobler life—is a most alarming matter. Indications, however, point to better things. The "Editor's Study" of a late *Harper's* complains that popular assemblages celebrating some notable event, such, for instance, as the Bryant Centennial, were almost, if not entirely, overlooked by newspaper reporters, as if their readers could only be satisfied with daily repasts of sensationalism, if not sensuality:

This is a grave, and not a trivial matter. It concerns the very life of the community. If the newspaper editor is in this case a good judge of what his readers desire to read his judgment is a terrible indictment of the intelligence and moral sympathies of the community. If he is mistaken he is doing what he can to fit the community to the character of the paper.

The cheering information is given that the matter is engaging the serious attention of the best newspapers, how to improve

the quality of reporting being the great journalistic inquiry, lest the circulation be seriously impaired by the dissatisfaction of thousands of readers whose good will is worth cultivating. Let the demand be so clear and convincing that authors, editors, and publishers shall be compelled to give more abundant recognition to all that pertains to the higher interests of the earth-life and a stronger championship to that which carries with it the brightest promise of the life that is to come.

2. The pulpit must maintain its old-time position, keeping in the front rank as a teacher of men and molders of opinion. A progressive age, a stationary or retrograde pulpit, is the favorite comparison. A writer in the *Westminster Review* states it clearly :

So long as literature was an expensive luxury, and the great body of the people were either absolutely unable to read or had no taste and no time for reading, it was not remarkable that they should put up with a low standard of pulpit eloquence. . . . But in these days of half-penny papers and six-penny magazines the humblest churchgoer may, and often does, have a higher ideal of what a sermon should be than even well-to-do people had fifty years ago. For the masses not only have their judgment and taste cultivated by reading, but they attend the lecture room and the theater as well as the church, and, accustomed to hear accomplished actors and brilliant platform lecturers, they are coming to expect from the pulpit entertainment and instruction, as well as exhortations to "trust in God and do the right," which must always carry with them a certain platitudinarian sameness. Now, it is because the pulpit does not come up to the standard of excellence already attained by the press, the platform, and the stage, each after its own manner, that men stay at home and read on Sundays, go out and stroll while the morning service is being held, or go to some secular or semisecular lecture hall at night. . . . In influence for civilization and enlightenment the press, with all its faults, leaves the pulpit helplessly, hopelessly, ignominiously in the shade.

This is overdrawn ; but there is no need of its even approaching the truth, with everything available for the sermon that makes a successful book or paper, the charm of voice, looks, and gesture being added ; with a theme that touches every experience of our life, solves the deepest problems of our destiny, and awaits application to the stirring events that influence the public mind and the questions that agitate the human heart ; with a mission to rightly develop the moral consciousness of our being, without which there cannot be true advancement ; and with the authority to sway every power of the human soul and help it to the

mastery, drawing arguments and motives from that wonderful revelation which has furnished material for some of the magnificent productions in art and literature that have secured world-wide fame.

There is no reason aside from the preacher himself why the pulpit should not be to-day what it once was—the highest power in society. It cannot and it must not compete with the press in scientific disquisitions, philosophical speculations, literary ventures, political economics, social gossip, or as a chronicler of current news; but, standing as the oracle of God to hearts and consciences agonizing in spiritual struggles or blunted by the six days' contact with real world-life, to utter platitudes and commonplaces, to deal in a mere conventional theology, to forget the living issues and practical needs of the hour and the study of current thought and opinion in poring over the musty records of antiquity or discoursing on the myths of past ages, is simply to provoke scorn and contempt for incompetency, to deserve keenest criticism for "alienation of the masses" and "decay of the pulpit," and to warrant the advice that "the best thing the preacher can do is to gather up his robes, bow to the editor and author, and retire." It is difficult for thoughtful men, even though they may be religious and loyal to the church service, to pass from the reading of clever and pointed editorials or vigorous and convincing articles in the periodical to hearing sermons dull, prosy, scarcely above mediocrity, and often painfully below it. How much less can such efforts be expected to reach the careless and indifferent, arousing their lethargy and awakening their interest in that other-worldliness which is, after all, the greatest want of the soul.

A certain vigorous preacher has said that "Christianity needs her Columbus to discover the 'new world' that is around and awaiting our conquest." That "new world" is, indeed, not far off, awaiting its more complete discoverer—a baptized pulpit—to reveal its yet hidden wonders of love and mercy and subjugate its yet unconquered forces to the sway of Him who is Lord of all. Let the preacher, with a vivid apprehension from personal experience of the value of his message, bring the constraining motives, ruling passions, and varied circumstances of life to the test of the two great commandments; let him try the stirring events that awaken men's interest, the great movements

that absorb their energies, and the innumerable forms of present progress by the everlasting principles of the Gospel; let him ring out boldly and earnestly a warning voice to a selfish and material Church; as God's ambassador let him utter the yearning compassion and tender love of the infinite One to men who are waiting and expecting God to speak to them; as man's best friend and counselor let him plead, warn, exhort, and strive that he may be reconciled to God; let him help the doubting to settle those heart questions which no one can answer for them, the faltering to a stronger hold on the good and true, and the burdened to the great Burden-bearer; let him cultivate, not less intellect and learning (the very circumstances of the age demand these), but more heart and conscience, a veritable incarnation of the Christianity he preaches—and men will be attracted by the mighty truths he enunciates. It will not be said, "The periodical speaks to hundreds, while the preacher speaks to units;" for a crowded temple will await him, the press itself will sit at his feet to learn those basic truths which must underlie its highest usefulness and achievement, and the pulpit will be what it was intended—"the power of God" and, consequently, the master of the world.

3. The pew must more clearly distinguish between the good and bad in the literature, of whatever kind, it patronizes. Not to do this is to aid the bad in the most effectual way. In using the term "bad" there is meant, not so much the vile and polluting, as the latitudinarian, neutral, and non-Christian. Take away the profits accruing from the sale of such publications to Christian people, and it would materially affect their financial success. A little sum in arithmetic will show that thousands of dollars go from this source annually to sustain papers that, more or less openly, violate decency and scatter broadcast material that must corrupt both public and private morals. The gambler, libertine, or criminal could not personally enter these Christian homes as a guest; but they go there, nevertheless, and that, too, with an indorsement that gives them a dangerous foothold.

An earnest appeal should be made to the pew that, if there be in the home anything that would tend to the destruction of an immortal soul or endanger the integrity and character of the children, a fire should be kindled on the kitchen hearth and

allowed to burn until not a single paragraph remains. Harmless though it may appear, issuing from a respectable publishing house and ably editing the latest news and telegrams, no matter—away with it! Boycott it as effectually as you would the literature of crime and lust. Put a guard at the door of the Sunday school library and, by a rigid supervision, protect that life which is at the most impressionable age from the nondescript productions that abound everywhere, eager to gain an entrance, but that can only result in enfeebling the intellect, if not unfitting it for devotion and making the pleasures of the Christian life appear tasteless and dull. Fiction cannot be excluded; but let it come in such elegance of language, chaste imagery, manly spirit, and pure sentiment as shall prove a savor of life unto life and guide aright the precious souls of the rising generation.

There is no power better fitted than the pew to concentrate and give direction and force to the rising public sentiment for the enactment and, especially, the enforcement of wise laws for the suppression of all classes of vile literature. Let the pew be deeply impressed with the responsibility of spreading a pure literature to the ends of the earth, itself contributing articles of commanding interest and Christian feeling written under the inspiration of the life of religion; let it enthusiastically sustain a fresh, vigorous, earnest, baptized Pulpit, thereby promoting and extending the influence of Christianity in the world; let it exemplify, and so imbue society with, the spirit and regenerative principles of the blessed Master—and the products of an evil press must sink into utter oblivion. "No talent will keep a corrupt book alive in a pure age. The Byrons will not be tolerated a day in the millennium of holiness." The press, pulpit, and pew, if they will, can soon usher in the golden day.

J. R. Brighton

ART. VI.—THE USE OF OUR FOUR GOSPELS BY JUSTIN MARTYR.

THE question whether Justin, the Christian philosopher and martyr, who flourished about the middle of the second century, makes use in his writings of any or all of our canonical gospels as authentic sources for the life and teachings of Christ, or whether he uses wholly or in part other sources, is a very important one. To determine this question with as much certainty as possible we have examined Justin's method of quoting the Greek version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, and also compared carefully with our Greek gospels Justin's statement of his sources and his account of the life and teachings of Christ, as he gives them in his two undoubted works, his *First Apology* and his *Dialogue with Trypho*. The objection brought against Justin's having used our gospels is the fact that his quotations do not always correspond exactly with them. Let us, then, see whether he always quotes accurately the Septuagint. For if he does not, why should we think that he would always quote the gospels accurately?

In his *First Apology*, addressed to Antoninus Pius and others about A. D. 138 or 139, he says that Moses through divine inspiration predicted that "a ruler will not fail from the Jews until he shall come for whom the kingdom [or royal power, βασιλειαν] is reserved" (§ 32). But the Septuagint which Justin used has, "A ruler shall not fail from Judah, nor a leader from his loins, until the things reserved for him shall come; and he is the expectation of the nations" (Gen. xlix, 10). Thus inaccurately does Justin quote this Messianic passage. Again, Justin quotes in § 54 the Messianic prophecy in Gen. xlix, 11, as follows: "Binding to the vine his colt, washing his robe in the blood of the grape." But the passage in the Septuagint is, "Binding to the vine his colt and to the tendril his ass's colt, he will wash in wine his robe, and in the blood of the grape his vesture." Justin's quotation is an abridgment of the passage. In § 60 Justin tells us that when the children of Israel had come out of Egypt and were in the desert venomous reptiles met them, both vipers and asps, and all kinds of serpents, which were killing the people, and that at the suggestion

of God Moses took brass and made it into the form of a cross and placed it upon the holy tabernacle, and said to the people, "If ye look at this figure and believe ye will be saved by it;" and when this was done, he (Moses) writes that the serpents died, but the people escaped death. With this statement let us compare the following account in the Septuagint:

And the Lord sent among the people deadly serpents, and they were biting the people; and many people of the children of Israel died. And the people, having come to Moses, said, We have sinned because we have spoken against the Lord and against thee; pray, therefore, to the Lord, and let him take away from us the serpent. And Moses prayed to the Lord for the people. And the Lord said unto Moses, Make for thyself a serpent, and set it upon a standard; and it shall come to pass that, if a serpent shall bite a man, every one bitten when he looks at it shall live. And Moses made a brazen serpent and set it upon a standard. And it came to pass, when a serpent bit a man and he looked upon the brazen serpent, he also lived.

Justin gives various particulars not found in Numbers. Did he find these particulars in some apocryphal book, or did he draw on his imagination for them? Doubtless they were derived from a lively imagination.

We have not space for any more instances of Justin's inaccurate quotations, abridgments, and transpositions of Scripture, but shall now consider how Justin characterizes the documents which he uses as authorities for the life and teachings of Christ. In § 33 of his *First Apology*, in giving an account of the miraculous conception of Christ, he says, "As those who have related all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ taught [teach], whom we believe." That Justin's account is taken from Matthew and Luke is manifest from his language. He represents the angel of God as announcing to the Virgin: "Behold, thou shalt conceive by the Holy Spirit, and bear a Son; and he shall be called the Son of the Highest. And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." A little before giving this announcement Justin says, "The power of God, having come upon the Virgin, overshadowed her." In this indirect quotation Justin uses the words *δύναμις*, *power*, *ἐπέρχομαι*, *to come upon*, and *ἐπισκιάζω*, *to overshadow*, all found in Luke's gospel. Justin's direct quotation is manifestly made up from both Matthew and Luke. The first half is the exact language of Luke i, 31, 32; "by

the Holy Spirit" is added from the context in the gospel; and other parts of the verses are omitted. The last half of Justin's quotation consists of the very words—sixteen in number—found in Matt. i, 21, beginning with the phrase, "And thou shalt call," and in the very same order. Is this agreement accidental? In § 66 of the *First Apology* Justin thus says: "The apostles in the memoirs made by them, which are called gospels [*εὐαγγέλια*], thus have delivered, that Jesus commanded them, having taken bread and having given thanks, and said, 'This do in remembrance of me; this is my body.' And the cup likewise having taken and having given thanks, he said, 'This is my blood;' and he imparted [it] to them alone." Justin's first two participles are the same as Luke's, who alone uses *εὐχαριστέω*, to give thanks, after *λαμβάνω*, to take, in reference to the bread. "This do in remembrance of me" is the exact language of Luke xxii, 19, except that Justin puts *μοῦ* for *ἐμῇν*. The second part of Justin's quotation, "And the cup likewise having taken," etc., is the language of Mark xiv, 23, 24, except that *ὁμοίως* is added for the *ὡσαύτως* of Luke. Justin does not quote the passages in full, for which he had no need. In § 67 Justin states: "On the [so] called day of the sun an assemblage is made of all [the Christians] who dwell in the different cities and country places, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time allows." The designation of gospels as *Ἀπομνημονεύματα*, *memoirs*, the name given to Xenophon's sketches of the life and teachings of Socrates, is very appropriate.

Let us next see how Justin, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, designates his sources for Christ's life. In § 88 Justin states that "the apostles of this our Christ himself have written, that when he came up from the water the Holy Spirit as a dove flew upon him." In § 100 Justin states: "In the gospel it is written that he [Christ] said, 'All things have been delivered to me by the Father,' and 'No one knows the Father except the Son, nor the Son except the Father, and to whom the Son may reveal him.'" But the gospel of Matthew (xi, 27) reads: "And no one knows the Son except the Father, nor does anyone know the Father except the Son, and to whom the Son may wish to reveal [him]." Justin thus changes the order of the clauses as found in Matthew, and also in Luke. But he does

not stand alone in this. Irenæus (about A. D. 180–200) has the same order of the words (*Hær.*, lib. ii, cap. vi *) as Justin. Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion*, lib. iv, cap. xxv) also: “Nemo scit qui sit Pater, nisi Filius; et qui sit Filius, nisi Pater, et cuicumque Filius revelaverit.” Epiphanius, a Greek writer (about A. D. 350–400), quotes the passage in nearly the same form as it stands in Matthew in the following places: *Hær.*, lib. liv, iv; lib. lxiv, ix; lib. lxv, vi; lib. lxxvi, vii. But in the following passages he has Justin’s order: lib. lxxiv, iv; lib. lxxiv, x; lib. lxxvi, xxix, *confutatio*. Justin uses in the passage γινώσκω, *to know*; and in the *First Apology*, § 63, where he also quotes the passage twice, he has the second aorist of the same verb ἔγνω. Matthew has ἐπιγινώσκω; but Luke has γινώσκω, like Justin. Epiphanius, in most of the passages to which we have referred, uses οἶδε, *knows*, perfect of εἶδω. Matthew and Luke have “to whom he may wish to reveal [him].” Justin, on the contrary, omits “may wish,” and has “may reveal him.” In the same way Epiphanius, in every instance that we have found, quotes the passage like Justin.† In § 101 Justin, speaking of the ill treatment of Christ by the Jews, says: “They said in irony those things which also are written in the memoirs of his apostles.” In § 103 Justin, speaking of the devil’s approaching Christ after he had come up from the Jordan, and the words had been spoken to him, “Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee,” says: “It is written in the memoirs of the apostles, he [the devil] having come to him and tempting him so far as to say to him, ‘Worship me,’ that Christ answered him, ‘Get thee behind me, Satan. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.’” Justin, while professing to give his Jewish antagonist the language addressed to Christ at his baptism, has done nothing more than give him, in the same order, the exact words of Psalm ii, 7, which contains a part of what is in our gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Lactantius (A. D. 314) quotes the passage in the same form ‡ (*Div. Inst.*, lib. iv, cap. xv, 1) as Justin. “Worship me,” as quoted by Justin, gives the substance of what the devil said. Christ’s answer in Justin is the exact

* Also substantially the same in lib. iv, cap. vi.

† Justin has ἀν, while Epiphanius has εἰς.

‡ The voice was heard from heaven, “‘Filius meus es tu, ego hodie,’” etc.

language of Matt. iv, 10, and the words are in the same order. Justin omits, "For it is written." In this same section (103) he says: "For in those memoirs which I affirm were composed by his apostles and their companions [it is written] that sweat poured down like clots [of blood] while he was praying and saying, 'Let this cup pass away, if it is possible.' " Ἰδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι, *sweat as clots* (of blood), are the exact words of Tischendorf's * text of Luke xxii, 44. Justin discriminates between the evangelists very accurately in this passage—"apostles [two] and their companions [two]."

In § 104 Justin, in speaking of Christ's sufferings as having been foretold, says: "It is written in the memoirs of his apostles that these things came to pass." In § 105 he says that when Christ gave up his spirit upon the cross he cried, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," the exact words and order found in Luke xxiii, 46. Justin adds: "As I have also learned this from the memoirs." Again, it is written in the "memoirs" that he said these things: "Except your righteousness shall exceed [the righteousness] of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." Justin's Greek consists of nineteen words exactly, the same and in the same order as they are found in Matt. v, 20, in the text of Tischendorf; and we find that this text stands exactly the same as in the two oldest codices, *Vaticanus* and *Sinaiticus* (about A. D. 350). Can we doubt that Justin's words were taken from Matthew's gospel and that this gospel was one of his "memoirs?" In § 106 Justin speaks of the star that appeared at the birth of Christ, by means of which "the Magi from Arabia came and worshiped him [Christ], as it is written in the memoirs of his apostles"—a clear reference to the gospel of Matthew. In § 107 Justin says to Trypho, the Jew, "It is written in the memoirs that your countrymen, disputing with him [Christ], said to him, 'Show us a sign,' and he answered them, 'A wicked and adulterous generation seeks a sign, and a sign shall not be given to them, except the sign of Jonas.'" There are thus sixteen words in Christ's answer, and they are exactly alike and in the same order in the Greek of both Justin and of Matt. xii, 39, except that

* Irenæus evidently had the words in his text; for he says if Christ had not possessed a human nature, "not would he have sweat drops of blood" (οὐδ' ἂν ἰδρωσε θρόμβους αἱματος). *Hær.*, lib. iii, cap. xxii (about A. D. 180).

Justin uses the plural "them" for the singular "it," as found in Matthew. Justin omits "the prophet" at the end.

We will next consider the passages manifestly taken from our gospels, though the source is not indicated. In the last part of § 14 of the *First Apology* Justin says, in reference to Christ's teachings: "The discourses [λόγοι] made by him were short and concise; for he was not a sophist, but his word was the power of God." * In § 15, he says: "Concerning chastity so far did he say, 'Whoever looks upon a woman to lust after her, has already committed adultery before God.'" Both Justin and the Greek text of Matt. v, 28, have πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἥδη ἐμοίχενσε τῇ καρδίᾳ, "for the lusting after has already committed adultery in [his] heart." Justin has "Whoever may look at a woman" (ἐμβλέπω, with the dative); Matthew has βλέπω, with an accusative. For the "whoever may" of Justin, Matthew has πᾶς ὁ, *everyone who*. On the insertion or omission of the pronoun *her* (αὐτήν) the oldest Greek manuscripts of Matthew differ. Justin, while he gives ἐμβλέπω in his quotation, afterward uses προσβλέπω to express the same thought, showing that he did not bind himself to the use of the same word. Why, then, should he have thought it necessary always to adhere to the very words of Matthew. He adds to his quotation from Matthew, "before God," to express the sense fully. Justin proceed in his quotations: "And if thy right eye cause thee to offend, knock it out; for it is profitable for thee with one eye to enter into the kingdom of heaven, rather than with the two to be sent into the eternal fire." The first sentence of this quotation consists of nine words in Greek, which are exactly the same and in the same order as in Matt. v, 29. Justin abridges Matthew's "pluck it out and cast [it] from thee," and gives us "knock it out." "For it is profitable for thee" is the exact language of Matt. v, 29. The last part of Justin's quotation is based on Mark ix, 47, or Matt. xviii, 9: "With one eye [μονόφθαλμον, the same word as Justin's] to enter into the kingdom of God, rather than having two eyes to be cast into the gehenna." Instead of "the gehenna," Justin gives "the eternal fire," for the simple reason that the Roman emperor would not know the meaning of "gehenna." "And who marries [a woman] divorced from another husband com-

* With reference to Matt. vii, 28, 29.

mits adultery," as given by Justin, is based on Matt. v, 32, "Whoever shall marry a divorced [woman] commits adultery." Justin uses the same three verbs as Matthew. "And there are some who have been made eunuchs by men, and some who were born eunuchs, and there are some who have made themselves eunuchs on account of the kingdom of heaven. But not do all receive this." This passage follows Matt. xix, 11, 12, very closely. *Εὐνοῦχος* and *Εἰνouchίζω* are both used in Justin and in Matthew; *γεννάω* is common to both; and *χωρέω* is used by both in the rare sense of being capable of receiving. A few words of the passage Justin omits. Christ said thus, continues Justin: "I came not to call [the] just, but sinners to repentance"—the exact language of Luke v, 32, except that Justin has the second aorist *ἦλθον*, *I came*, instead of the perfect as used by the evangelist. But in the parallel passage in the gospels Justin's form of the verb is used.

"Concerning the loving of all men, these things he taught: 'If you love those who love you, what do you new? for also the fornicators do this. But I say unto you, Pray for your enemies [*ἐχθροί*], and love those who hate you, and bless those who curse you, and pray for those who threaten you.'" The first part of Justin's quotation is the exact language of Matt. v, 46, and Luke vi, 32. But the next part, "what do you new?" is not in the gospels; it is either "what reward have you?" as in Matthew, or "what thanks have you?" as in Luke. Justin gives the sense of the evangelists well when he adds, "For also the fornicators do this," instead of "the publicans" of Matthew and "the sinners" of Luke. "Pray for your enemies, and love those who hate you" is not the exact language of the gospels, but it is the substance of Christ's teaching. But Justin, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, § 96, says that Christ taught, saying, "Love your enemies"—the exact language of Matt. v, 44, and Luke vi, 27. The last part of Justin's quotation, beginning with "Bless those that curse you," is the language of Luke vi, 28. Justin uses *εὐχόμεαι* for *προσεύχουμαι*, *to pray*, for the first word is the classical one. Justin proceeds: "Respecting sharing with the needy and doing nothing for reputation, he said these things: 'Give to the one asking, and from the one wishing to borrow [from thee] do not turn away. For if you lend [to those] from whom ye hope to receive, what do you new [or

uncommon]? This also the publicans do. Do not lay up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust corrupt [destroy] and robbers break [dig] through. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust corrupt.' The first part of Justin's quotation follows quite closely Matt. v, 42. The next sentence, ending with "hope to receive," is the exact language of Luke vi, 34. "This also the publicans do" is substantially Matt. v, 46. The next verses of Justin, making twenty-eight words, are nearly the exact language of Matt. vi, 19, 20. The words *σῆς*, *moth*, *βρῶσις*, *rust*, and *ἀφαιξίω*, *to corrupt* or *destroy*, outside of Matthew are nowhere found combined as they are in Justin. *Σῆς*, *moth*, with the exception of the passage in Matthew, is found only once in the New Testament. Justin omits the noun "treasures" after his verb *θησαυρίζω*, *to lay up*. "For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, but lose his own soul [life]? or what will he give in exchange for it?" This is manifestly taken from Matt. xvi, 26. Justin uses the present, instead of the future, of *ὠφελέω*, *to profit*, *ἀπόλλυμι* instead of *ζημιώω*, *to suffer loss*, omits "man," and puts "it" instead of "his soul [or life]." All the rest of the words are the same.

Justin continues: "And be ye kind and compassionate, as also your Father is kind and compassionate, and makes his sun rise upon sinners and just and wicked." This is based on Luke vi, 35, 36, and Matt. v, 45. In the first of these passages it is said: "And ye shall be the sons of the Highest; because he is kind to the ungrateful and wicked. Be ye compassionate, as your Father is compassionate." Matthew has: "He makes his sun rise upon wicked and good." "Be not anxious about what ye shall eat, or what ye shall put on." This is the language of Matt. vi, 25, some words being omitted by Justin. "Are ye not better than the fowls and the beasts? and God feeds them," is taken substantially from Luke xii, 24; but Justin adds, "and the beasts," not in Luke. "Do not be anxious therefore about what ye shall eat, or what ye shall put on; for your heavenly Father knows that ye have need of these things. But seek the kingdom of heaven, and all these things shall be added to you. For where the treasure is, there also is the mind [*νοῦς*] of the man. And do not these things to be beheld by men; otherwise ye have no reward from your Father who is in heaven." The

foregoing language of Justin, making sixty or seventy words, is for the most part the very words of Matt. vi, 1, 25, 32, 33. The last clause of Justin begins with the peculiar words *εἰ δὲ μήγε*, *otherwise*, just as in Matt. vi, 1, and has all the other words exactly as in Matthew, except "from" your Father, instead of "with" your Father.

In § 16 Justin states that respecting (our) being long-suffering and serviceable to all and free from anger, these are the things which he (Christ) said: "To the one smiting thy cheek offer also the other; and the one who is taking away thy coat or cloak do not forbid. Whoever is angry is liable to the fire; and to everyone who compels thee to go a mile follow him two; and let your good works shine forth before men, that they, seeing them, may worship your Father who is in heaven." The first two of these precepts is nearly the language of Luke vi, 29. All the verbs and nouns are the same. *Σιαγών*, *cheek*, occurs both in Luke and Justin; it is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Matt. v, 39. It is the classic word for "jawbone." "Whoever is angry," etc., is an abridgment of Matt. v, 22. "And to everyone who compels thee," etc., is substantially Matt. v, 41. The rare word *ἀγγαρεύω*, *to compel to go*, occurs both in Justin and Matt. v, 41; elsewhere only in Matt. xxvii, 32, and Mark xv, 21. The precept, "Let your good works shine," etc., gives in an abridged form the sense of Matt. v, 16. "Concerning not swearing at all," says Justin, "he exhorted us always thus to speak the truth: 'Swear not at all; but let your yea [be] yea, and the nay, nay. What is more than these [is] of the evil.'" Here we have an undoubted quotation from Matt. v, 34, 37. The last line of Justin is the exact language of the second half of Matt. v, 37. *Ἐστίν* is omitted in Justin. Justin represents Christ as saying: "'The greatest commandment is, The Lord thy God thou shalt worship, and him only shalt thou serve, with all thy heart, and with all thy strength, the Lord God who made thee.' And one having come to him and said, 'Good Master,' he answered him, saying, 'No one is good except God alone, who made all things.'" The first of these passages is based on Mark xii, 28-30, and the second on Mark x, 17, 18, where it is found in the same language, except that Justin uses *μόνος* instead of *εἷς*. Justin in the first extract, after "God," adds "who made thee," and

after the second extract, "who made all things." This would indicate to the heathen emperor what God Christ referred to.

Justin, to show that Christianity requires acts, not simply words, says Christ thus taught: "Not everyone who says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father, who is in heaven." This quotation consists of twenty-five words, exactly the same and in the same order as in Matt. vii, 21, only the emphatic *οὐχί* being substituted in Justin for *οὐ*. Is it possible to doubt that this passage was taken from our gospel of Matthew? Justin says (§ 17), in reference to the question of tribute, "Christ asked, 'Tell me whose image has the coin?' They said, 'Cæsar's.' Again he answered them, 'Render therefore the things of Cæsar to Cæsar, and the things of God to God.'" This answer of Christ is the exact words, in the same order, found in Matt. xxii, 21, except that Justin puts before the second "Cæsar" the article, wanting in Matthew. Justin says that Christ declared, "To whom God has given more, more also will be demanded of him," which is found substantially in Luke xii, 48. In § 19 Justin says: "We know that our teacher Jesus Christ said, 'The things impossible with men are possible with God.'" This is the substance of Matt. xix, 26. "And do not fear those who kill you, and after this are not able to do anything; but fear him who after death is able to cast both soul and body into gehenna." Justin then explains "gehenna." The passage is based upon Matt. x, 28, and Luke xii, 4, 5. But no stronger proof can be given of Justin's use of Matthew's gospel and its authority with him than the way in which he quotes the prophecy of Micah v, 2. Instead of following the Septuagint, he gives the exact form of the prophecy as contained in Matt. ii, 6: "And thou Bethlehem, land of Judah, art in no wise least among the princes of Judah; for out of thee shall come forth a governor, who shall feed my people." Justin omits "Israel" at the end of the verse. There are twenty-two words in this quotation without the slightest deviation. In the Septuagint there are about a dozen words in the prophecy not found in Matthew and Justin. Again, Justin in quoting Zech. ix, 9, follows at first the Septuagint exactly: "Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion; cry out, daughter of Jerusalem." But in quoting the rest of the verse, which is

the only part that Matthew quotes (xxi, 5), he leaves the Septuagint and follows the evangelist: "Behold, thy king comes to thee, meek, sitting upon an ass, and [even] a colt, the foal of an ass." Matthew has "and" before "sitting" and "upon" repeated before colt, wanting in Justin. The Septuagint has some different words, differently arranged.

We shall next consider the remaining passages concerning Christ's acts and teachings in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, the Jew. Justin says (§ 17): "He [Christ] exclaimed among you, 'It is written, My house is a house of prayer; but you have made it a den of robbers.'" This is from Matt. xxi, 13, and is nearly accurate. Further: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye tithe mint and rue, but the love of God and judgment you do not regard; whitewashed sepulchers, appearing beautiful without, but within full of dead men's bones." In the first of these clauses Justin combines portions of Matt. xxiii, 23, and Luke xi, 42. The second clause, "whitewashed sepulchers," etc., is taken from Matt. xxiii, 27. And still further: "Woe to you, scribes, because ye have the keys, and you yourselves do not enter in, and those entering in you prevent, blind guides." This passage is the substance of Luke xi, 52. Justin says (§ 35) that Christ declared: "Many false Christs and false apostles will arise and lead astray many of the faithful." This is based on Matt. xxiv, 5, 24; but Matthew does not mention false apostles. In § 49 Justin says that the forerunner of Christ, sitting at the river Jordan, cried out: "I baptize you with water unto repentance; but the stronger than I will come, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear. He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing floor and gather the wheat into the garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire." There is overwhelming proof that this passage came from Matt. iii, 11, 12. In Justin the Greek consists of fifty-four words. The Greek of Matthew has fifty-seven words. There are only a few deviations from Matthew in Justin. He has "the stronger than I will come" instead of "the one who cometh after me is stronger than I." Justin has evidently abridged this. Justin has one αὐτοῦ, *his*, too many (Hebraistic ?); lacks αὐτοῦ, *his*, with "wheat," where Matthew has it; and puts συνάξει, *will gather*, after the object

"wheat," instead of before it, as in Matthew. All the other words, about fifty in number, are precisely the same and in the same order in Justin and in Matthew. The improbability of all these words thus accidentally coinciding in both writers is as millions to one. We may say it is impossible.

In this same section (49) Justin remarks: "Our Christ said to those who were saying that Elias must come before Christ, 'Elias will come and restore all things; but I say unto you that Elias has already come, and they did not know him, but they did to him what they wished.'" "And it is written," says Justin, "that then the disciples understood that he spoke to them concerning John the Baptist." This is taken from Matt. xvii, 11-13. Here are thirty-three words in Greek, exactly the same and in the same order as the words in the Greek text of Matthew, except that Justin has the future, "will come," in reference to Elias, instead of the present, as in Matthew, and omits *ἐν* before the second "him," which is in Matthew. This quotation is from Matthew beyond all doubt, since it gives the evangelist's own remark upon what Christ said. In § 51 Justin represents Christ as saying, "The law and the prophets [were] until John the Baptist, since which the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. And if ye will receive [it] he is the Elias who is to come. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." This is abridged from Matt. xi, 12-15. In § 76 Justin says that Christ taught, "They shall come from the east [and from the west] and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into the outer darkness"—manifestly taken from Matt. viii, 11, 12, with slight change. Justin also states that Christ said that when he shall pronounce sentence upon the guilty he will say, "Go away into outer darkness, which the Father hath prepared for Satan and his angels." This is found substantially in Matt. xxv, 41. Justin continues: "He said, 'I give you power to trample upon serpents and scorpions and millipeds and upon all the power of the enemy.'" This is substantially the language of Luke x, 19, except that "millipeds" is wanting in Luke. Justin says that Christ cried out before he was crucified, "It is necessary that the Son of man suffer many things, and be rejected by the scribes, and be crucified and rise on the third day," which is found, partly

exact in phraseology and substantially correct in sense, in Luke ix, 22.

Justin says in § 81 that in reference to the resurrection and judgment Christ said, "They will neither marry nor be given in marriage, but will be like the angels [*ἰσάγγελοι*], the children of God [being the children] of the resurrection." The passage is an abridgment of Luke xx, 35, 36. The Greek word *ισάγγελοι*, *like the angels*, is found both in Luke and Justin, and apparently occurs nowhere else. In § 100 Justin says that, the Virgin Mary having received faith and grace, the angel Gabriel, announcing to her the good news that the Spirit of the Lord shall come upon her and the power of the Highest shall overshadow her, wherefore that holy thing which is to be born of her is the Son of God, she answered, 'Let it be to me according to thy word.' This is the exact language found in Luke i, 35, 38, with the exception of the change of the second person *σύ*, *thou*, to *αὐτή*, *she*, and the substitution by Justin of "Spirit of the Lord" for "Holy Spirit," as in Luke. In § 125 Justin refers to the parable of the sower as follows: "My Lord said, 'The sower went forth to sow the seed; and some fell on the road, and some among thorns, some upon rocky places, and other upon the good ground.'" This seems based on Matt. xiii, 3-8. In § 78 Justin gives quite an extended account of the birth of Christ and the visit of the Magi, which is evidently taken from Matthew's gospel. In speaking of the Magi he says, "They worshiped the child and offered it gifts—gold, and frankincense, and myrrh." These three articles are those enumerated in Matt. ii, 11, and are in the same order.

Our examination of the passages in Justin giving Christ's history and teachings, and our comparison of them with those accounts which we have in the gospels of Matthew and Luke, prove beyond all possibility of doubt that these two gospels were, indeed, parts of the memoirs of the apostles and their companions which Justin so often quotes as his authorities for the life and teachings of Christ. Our attention has not yet been especially directed to Justin's use of Mark's gospel. This is in many respects so much like Matthew's that we cannot always discriminate the quotations, and Justin does not appear to have taken many passages from it, although we have seen that in some instances he appears to have quoted it. But we find clear

proof that Mark's gospel was a part of Justin's authentic sources for the life of Christ. In § 106 of his *Dialogue with Trypho* he says, "And the statement that he [Christ] changed the name of Peter, one of his apostles—it has also been written in the memoirs of him [Christ] that this also was done, besides his also having changed the names of two others, being brothers, sons of Zebedee, and given them the names of Boanerges, which is 'sons of thunder.'" Mark's gospel is the only one that states that Christ changed the names of the sons of Zebedee to "sons of thunder" (Mark iii, 17). This passage of Justin shows that Mark's gospel was a part of the "memoirs." The "memoirs of him" (or "his memoirs") named in the quotation from Justin can hardly be referred to as Peter's memoir of Christ, on the supposition that this apostle was the authority for Mark's gospel, but the reference must rather be to the memoirs of Christ, or the gospel history. Justin always quotes the gospels as a unit, and never singles out one of them.

Here the question arises, Did the gospel of John make a part of the memoirs which Justin says were composed by the apostles of Christ and their companions, and does Justin quote this fourth gospel? These are really two distinct questions. This gospel might have been a part of Justin's canon without being quoted, for he doubtless held other Christian scriptures as canonical besides those he quotes. Still, there is a probability that if the fourth gospel was a part of the memoirs he would quote it. That Justin does, in fact, quote John's gospel as an authority can be shown both from passages in his *First Apology* and from his *Dialogue with Trypho*, the Jew. In § 61 of the first of these works, in speaking of baptism and regeneration, Justin says, "For Christ said, 'Unless you are born again you cannot enter the kingdom of heaven,' because it is evident to all that it is impossible for those once born to enter the wombs of their mothers." This is manifestly taken from John iii, 3-5. John has γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν, *be born again*, or *from above*, an adverb separate from the verb. Justin has an adverb with the verb, ἀναγεννηθῆναι, *be born again*. Christ repeats the statement in another form: "If anyone is not born of water and of spirit he is not able to enter into the kingdom of heaven." The last six words of the Greek are the same as Justin's, except that the verb is in a different mode. Justin's quotation is as exact as in some

other instances respecting which there can be no doubt. The reference to the impossibility of entering a second time into a mother's womb and being born, found both in Justin and in John, confirms the proof that the passage is a quotation from this evangelist. Justin, in § 32, calls Christ the *Logos*—the "Word." The *Logos*, says he, "is also the Son who, in a certain way being made flesh, has been born man." In § 21 Justin calls the *Logos* "the first begotten of God." These passages in Justin most naturally have their basis in John i, 1, 14, 18. Justin, in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (§ 88), represents John the Baptist replying to those who thought him the Messiah, "I am not the Christ," just as he says of himself in John i, 20—language found nowhere else in the gospels. In his *First Apology* (§ 52) Justin quotes, as from Zechariah, respecting the Jewish people, "Then shall they look upon him whom they pierced." But this is not at all the rendering of Zech. xii, 10, in the Septuagint; but it is the language of John xix, 37—*"Οψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν*. The Greek is exactly the same in John and in Justin. The passage in the Apocalypse (i, 7) is a different construction. Is there any reasonable doubt that Justin took the passage from John's gospel? In § 93 Justin states that "the *Logos* says, Whoever loves the Lord God with all his heart," etc.: In § 23 of his *Dialogue with Trypho*, in speaking in depreciation of the Jewish Sabbath, he says, "Do you see that the elements are not idle, nor do they keep the Sabbath day?" This language appears to have been suggested to Justin by the words of Christ addressed to the Jews respecting his working miracles on the Sabbath: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (John v, 17). The gospel of John was not so well adapted as the others to Justin's purpose in presenting the claims of Christianity to a heathen emperor or in discussing the Messiahship of Christ with a Hebrew.

That our four gospels alone were Justin's authorities for the gospel history may be inferred from the fact that Tatian, an enthusiastic disciple of Justin, made (about A. D. 160 or 170) a harmony of our four gospels (*Diatessaron*), which has been recently discovered and published. Can we for a moment suppose that the gospels used by Justin (about A. D. 140–150), and which he states were written by the apostles and their companions and were read along with the writings of the prophets

every Sunday in the Christian assemblies throughout the Roman empire, were displaced by another set of gospels—our four—about twenty or thirty years later, without the slightest notice being taken of it, without any controversy upon the subject, and without the action of an ecumenical council? Do not men stick stubbornly to the old? It takes a long time to bring into general use a revised and improved translation of the Scriptures. How, then, could one set of gospels be quietly substituted for another set in so short a time, without leaving in history a vestige of such a change? The gospels of the last part of the second century were the same as those of the middle of the century; and those of the middle the same as those of the first part of the century. Old Christians of the last half of the second century knew what gospels they had had in the first half; those of the first half knew what gospels they had had in the last half of the first century. The gospel torch was transmitted without interruption from the last half of the first century to the last half of the second. And the very copies of the gospels made and read in the last part of the first century would be read in the churches in the second and third centuries.

But the question still remains to be considered, Did Justin use in addition to our canonical gospels some other gospels or histories or traditions of Christ? We can decide this only by an examination of the passages supposed to be extra-canonical found in his writings. The first of these which we shall consider is that found in § 47 of Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*. "Wherefore," says Justin, "our Lord Jesus Christ said: 'In what condition I find you, in this I will judge you.'" Justin had been speaking of God's mercy to the returning sinner and of his knowing a backsliding saint only as a sinner. He then asserts that Christ taught the same doctrine as had been set forth in Ezekiel. We cannot find Justin's words in our gospels; but the substance of them is certainly implied in all the teachings of Christ respecting the divine judgment. We see it in the case of the man who was not robed in a wedding garment. Not very different from Justin's manner of quoting, Paul says (Eph. v, 14): "Wherefore it [the Scripture] saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." There is no such passage as this in the Old Testament; but it appears to be based upon Isa. lx, 1; xxix, 10.

We have found in Clement of Alexandria (about A. D. 191-202) a passage similar to the one in Justin: "For he says [that is, God, as the whole context shows] in whatever condition [or things] I find you, in this [or these] I will judge you."* Thus, it is possible that Justin made a mistake in thinking that Christ had used the language. And Justin certainly has blundered in matters of this kind. About thirty years ago one of the most eminent ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who had been president of one of our oldest colleges, said in a public discourse delivered in Baltimore, "Our blessed Saviour says that all that a man hath he will give for his life!" Did he quote an apocryphal gospel, or did he make a mistake?

In his *Dialogue with Trypho*, § 88, Justin says that when Christ was among men he performed the works of a carpenter, namely, "he made ploughs and yokes." There is no need of hunting up an apocryphal gospel for the foundation of this statement. The question asked in Mark vi, 3: "Is not this the carpenter?" furnished Justin with a sufficient basis for his statement. Justin's remark that Christ was born in a cave at Bethlehem † was most probably founded on a tradition, as he himself lived in Palestine. In § 88 of the *Dialogue with Trypho*, speaking of the baptism of Christ, he says, "When he had descended to the waters a fire was kindled in the Jordan." This is certainly not found in our gospels, nor has it a basis in them; and it is uncertain from what source it was taken. But why may not Justin have derived it from tradition? Born probably not more than seventy or eighty years after Christ's ministry and but a few years after the death of the apostle John, there must have been many traditions respecting Christ still fresh among the people of Palestine among whom Justin lived. And it is remarkable that he has given us apparently only two instances in which he has used tradition, so closely does he adhere to apostolic authority. But Justin discriminates the statement that "a fire was kindled in the Jordan" from the statements of the evangelists, for he adds, "And the apostles of this Christ of ours have written that the Holy Spirit as a dove lit upon him."

There remains one other passage to be considered, found in Justin's *First Apology* (§ 35): "For as the prophet said, 'Revil-

* *Liber Quis Dives Salvetur*, § 346.

† *Dialogue with Trypho*, § 78.

ing him, they set [him] upon the judgment seat [*βῆμα*], and said, Judge for us.'” Professor Drummond suggested that Justin took the verb as transitive in the sentence, “And he [Pilate] sat [*ἐκάθισεν*] upon the judgment seat [*βῆμα*],” supposing it to mean, “And they set him [Jesus] upon the judgment seat.” Professor Thayer holds this view, but thinks that Justin did nothing more than follow the same idea as found in the fragments of the recently discovered gospel of Peter: “And they set him [Christ] upon the seat of judgment, saying, Judge rightly, King of Israel.” This gospel of Peter is mentioned by Serapion, Bishop of Antioch (about A. D. 190). It was used by some in the ecclesiastical district of Rhossus, not far from Antioch. He states that he obtained a copy of it from those who studied it, who were the successors of those followers of the heretical Marcianus “whom we call Docetæ.”* This gospel, which certainly belongs to the Docetæ, may not be as old as Justin’s *First Apology*, and it is very doubtful that Justin ever saw it. It is more likely that the author of the so-called gospel may have seen Justin’s work. Westcott thinks that Justin had in mind Isa. lviii, 2, “They ask of me just judgment.” Justin seems to have read John xix, 13, thus: “Pilate brought out Jesus, and set him on the judgment seat, and said, in mockery, Judge for us.” For, of course, Christ was set upon the judgment seat for some purpose, which Justin’s imagination could easily supply. He has given us excellent specimens of what he could do in this line in his additions and explanations respecting the brazen serpent in Numbers. Justin has the same words, ἐπὶ βήματος, upon (the) bema, or judgment seat, as John, while the gospel of Peter has two different words—καθέδραν κρίσεως, seat of judgment. The passage in Justin furnishes an additional probable proof of his use of John’s gospel. The character of the fragments of the gospel of Peter shows one thing most clearly—that it could never have been one of Justin’s authorities.

* Eusebius, *Hist. Ec.*, lib. vi, cap. xlii.

Henry M. Harman

ART. VII.—DIVINE REVELATION.

THE fact of a divine revelation we ought to be able to assume. We posit that when we postulate an Intelligence in this universe other than our own. For if the universe have a maker it cannot but be that he shall stand revealed in what he has made. The miracle, then, is not in the fact of revelation, for it would, indeed, be a miracle if there were none. If the heavens are the "work of his fingers," and if he has "ordained the moon and the stars," that is sufficient to "declare his glory," which in itself is a revelation. God is truly seen in what he does. There is no speech or language where that voice is not heard. The sage and the savage alike hear it, though, it may be, not equally. But God is not limited to revelation through his works. "He that formed the eye, shall he not see?" He that gave to man speech, shall he not speak? Mind infinite in contact with mind finite, the Spirit of God in communication with the spirit of man, is indeed a reasonable assumption. Without so much, at least, a moral government would be impossible. For the Being "not ourselves" could not make for righteousness if he could not write his law on the hearts and consciences of men. The moral nature of man demands such a law, and that in itself is the highest proof that the demand has been met. The want is normal, and the supply is natural; and the natural supply should never be put in the category of the miraculous.

The miracle should rather be in the fact that, the want once having been met, its supply should ever cease. In point of fact, it never has ceased, for God's revelation of himself is not confined to any one day or age. It does not mark an epoch. It is not limited to any speech or writing or book. Its gift or manifestation does not imply favoritism in one direction or neglect in another; neither does it imply activity on the part of God up to a certain moment, and ever after that a suspension of revelation. Revelation is not so much a consummation as it is a movement or process. God is infinite; therefore the last word concerning him can never be uttered. Whether we find the word of God in nature, in a book, or in a person, nature must be investigated, the book interpreted, and the person apprehended. Nature is yielding up her secrets, the book is

being better interpreted, and we are coming to know more of the Christ. Revelation is always conditioned by the limitations of the finite. It is never, therefore, so much a question as to what God has given as it is as to how much we have been able to receive. Men in a way are everywhere seeking after God if haply they may find him. The quest is the same; the difference is in the results. It is neither God's partiality nor his fault that all are not equally successful, for there is what may be called fortune even in the matter of seeking after God. The conditions are not always equally favorable, and the seekers are not alike earnest, honest, and successful.

The manifoldness of the *verbum Dei*, revealer of truth, and the universality of its manifestations are not sufficiently understood. It is not limited to one book, but is found in many books; it is not the utterance of a few prophets in some particular age, but of God's teachers in all the ages; it is not the exclusive possession of any one nation, but is in some measure the heritage of all nations; it is not the basis of any one religion alone to the exclusion of all others, for God hath not left himself without witnesses in any nation. God is in all the ages, among all the peoples, in all things, and manifesting himself every hour. Let us, if we may, avoid even the pantheism which is implied in Emerson's "over-soul;" but let us not fail to find glimpses of God and his truth everywhere and in all things—in all art and science, in all poetry and philosophy, in all history and in all religion, above all, through all, and in all—transcendent, yet immanent, and, therefore, a continuous, progressive revelation, manifold and universal.

By "universal" is not meant that God and truth have been equally known in all the ages, nor among all the nations, any more than they are equally known by all persons now in the same nation; nor by "manifold," that God is equally in all events or equally revealed in all books and persons. But they do mean that no nation or tribe has been overlooked or neglected; for fatherhood implies universal care. So long as the gods were simply national deities so long were the religions but ethnic; but when Jesus revealed God as Father and Lord of all the foundation was laid for a cosmopolitan religion. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" had a broad foundation on which to stand, nothing less, indeed,

than "all power . . . in heaven and in earth;" not readily perceived, of course, because of ignorance, narrowness, national prejudices, and indifference. That God was not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also, and "not a respecter of persons" were revelations of deep significance and difficult of comprehension—revelations not made earlier, doubtless, because the world was not "able to bear them." But facts they were before they were revealed; and the universal Father had cherished his children in all lands and during all the ages and had been revealing himself to them.

That the supreme revelation is to be found in one book and in one Person is no reason why fragments of truth should not be found in many books and in many persons and in all things and everywhere. We do not rob the infinite when we postulate the finite. Solon and Lyeurgus do not disparage Jesus, or Socrates, Confucius, Zoroaster, or Buddha equal the Christ. God did not overlook the valleys of the Nile, the Euphrates, and the Ganges in his care for that of the Jordan; nor were Egypt, Persia, Mesopotamia, India, and China of less concern to him than Palestine. In no nation had he left himself without witnesses, and in all lands he had raised up "schoolmasters," of greater or less efficiency, to bring men unto Christ. The recent Parliament of Religions gave tremendous emphasis to the fact of "other sheep . . . not of this fold." And why not? If a man is "accepted according to that he hath," and if in "every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him," why should there not be a multitude whom no man can number out of every tribe and nation under heaven whom Jesus shall bring with him? But these men who have received a measure of God's revelation, these men who, nevertheless, are dissatisfied with what they have and what they are—how shall we best bring these "other sheep" to be with Jesus? Shall we deny their intelligence, repudiate their morality, and decry their religion wholesale, or shall we acknowledge that they also have been "taught of God," and then proceed to teach them the "way of God more perfectly?"

But this fact of a universal revelation, a revelation, to some extent, to people in all lands, carries with it a revelation throughout all time. The measure is never what God wants to give, what he unfolds to us, but always what we can receive,

what we can comprehend. The limitations are always on the side of the finite, and never on the side of the infinite. But the finite is moving up, is gaining in power to receive and comprehend. If men are increasing in knowledge it must be that they are increasing also in their knowledge of God. Nature contains for us a larger revelation to-day than it did in the times long gone by. "Lo, these are parts of his ways" is not true to the same extent now that it was in the days of Job, because we know far more of the universe than was known then—its extent, its laws, and what they teach. If the heavens declared the glory of God, and the firmament showed his handiwork in the days of the psalmist, they do much more than that now, for we are beginning to read into their declarations both fatherhood and love. For long ages men saw the lightnings flash and heard the thunders roar only to stand in awe in the presence of such malific power; now they bless the beneficence which is wrapped up in the fact that such omnific force can be harnessed into the service of man. Nature will reveal to us more and more of God, because we are to understand nature better and better. If we could comprehend just what God meant to say to us in nature, and what he will say to us some time, because some time we shall at least approximately understand him, I doubt if we should need much else except Jesus and the revelation contained in him. God is not misrepresented in nature; he was sincere in making the universe, and, therefore, it must contain for us a great revelation of himself. It is not necessary to disparage God in nature in order to exalt him in his written word. He is in all that he has done as well as in all that he has said. Action is speech; and it is even more so in God than it is in men. The entire universe is singing "The hand that made us is divine."

The revelation of God in nature and in the written word, as well as in the person of Jesus Christ, is for all men during all future time. And, like Jesus himself, this revelation must increase. We are just now learning that the book and the revelation contained in the book are not identical. The results, however, of critical investigation go to show, in this case as in others, that the treasure is in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be seen to be of God, and not of men. It is a distinct gain to know approximately what

elements in the Bible are human and what are divine, because the vehicle should bear the burden of the treasure, and not the treasure that of the vehicle. But it has not always been so. We have imputed to God the measure of a man. We have included him in our limitations and imputed to him our comprehensions, our mistranslations, our uncritical readings, and called it all the word of God. Denying, as we are bound to do, the infallibility and inerrancy of the Church, we yet have defended the infallibility and inerrancy of its decrees and the work of its councils. No wonder that intelligent men have protested! The same men to-day are saying, "Let the Lord our God speak unto us, and we will listen." God has spoken to us. His word is sure and cannot fail. Men trust in it and are not ashamed. The vehicle that brings to us the knowledge of Jesus is by that fact a revelation. Jesus not only embalms the history which contains him, but has become the center of nearly all history since his advent. The serious, almost malignant attempt that was made to reduce him to a myth has provoked the moral demonstration that, of all great personages in the past, Christ is the most historic. That he is the certainty of all certainties, the Alpha and the Omega, is shown in the fact that, whereas men once made the miracles prove Jesus, Jesus now proves the miracles. God is being revealed in him as never before. Knees are bowing, and tongues are confessing in increasing ratio that "Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

The better knowledge of nature, the better interpretation of the book, and the better comprehension of the Christ, all go to constitute a continuous, progressive revelation. This is much; but is there nothing more? Is there no longer any "open vision?" Is God now precluded by the "reign of law" from speaking to men? If so now, why not, then, always? The reign of law, whatever that may mean, was never less than it is now. We do but discredit the fact of revelation during all the past when we assign reasons against inspiration and revelation now which have always existed. God is not only the God of the living, but he is himself the living God; and this is *par excellence* the dispensation of his Holy Spirit. Passing strange it is that in such a dispensation the *dictum*, that its chief characteristic is the utter absence of spirit revelation, should gain such standing

that to contradict it should quite amount to heresy! We complain, and with good reason, when men by their theories shut God out of his universe; with still greater reason may we complain when he is denied contact with the human spirit, that he may illuminate and guide it. For how can God be immanent in history if he may not inspire the makers of history, not in respect to action simply, but in respect to thought and speech as well? Why should we hesitate to say, with Bishop Fowler, in his recent great speech in Chicago, that Washington and Lincoln were inspired by the Almighty for their work? But their work included speech and writing quite as much as action. If men of old, who were but "earthen vessels," and very earthen at that, could be and were inspired to write what God would reveal, why may not men now who are immeasurably their superiors as specimens of Christian manhood be also inspired to say and write what God would have us to hear and know? Even if the young man, Elihu, who had to "speak" in order that he might be "refreshed," did say it, "There is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." And why should we hesitate to claim this? God is not dead; he has not abandoned his universe; he has not abdicated as a ruler or left us fatherless; he is still in communication with the human spirit. Preachers pray in all earnestness and sincerity that God will inspire them for their work. Do they mean it? Men say—often and often do they say of the preacher—"That man was truly inspired to-day." Do they believe that? Was the message to them an inspired message, and did it contain for them a revelation? If not, then language has no meaning. And yet many draw back, as though we make God dead in the past if we claim him to be alive now, and as though we disparage the inspiration of the prophets and apostles if we claim that men, even better men, are inspired to-day. The canon, whether rightly or wrongly, is closed, but let us devoutly thank God that the revelation continues. For there is nothing that this age needs more to know than that God "still lives," and lives to speak to men.

No age ever more needed the direct and immediate contact of God with men than this. It has problems to solve such as no other age ever had. That they may be truly and rightly solved there is urgent need that "additional light should break forth

from God's word" from and in all directions. Nothing more wholesome and inspiring to the Church could possibly happen than that it should become thoroughly impressed with the fact that a "burden" of the Lord, a real message from God, comes to it through the ministry of the word. Nor would its influence be less salutary on the ministry itself. The too frequent levity of the mere rhetor would be exchanged for the deep, serious spirit of the prophet; the defenses of creeds, councils, and politics would give place to a more thorough exhibition of the ethical and the spiritual; and the question, What have men taught and believed? would be superseded by the far more important one, What ought we to teach and believe now? We cannot live on the past any more than we can live without it. We cannot bolt it down without discrimination. A wise eclecticism will reject of it as well as receive from it; and progress will depend quite as much on what is rejected as on what is received. The world moves, but it moves on toward God, and not away from him. In moving toward God it also moves toward Jesus, the Christ, and is becoming Christocentric as well as theocentric, which shows that God and Christ are at least ethically one. Jesus to-day is the center of all progress. The one immaculate Person and the one inerrant Teacher the world, in its progress, is taking along with it. He is with us still, revealing God; for the better he is known the more plainly does it appear that he that hath seen Jesus hath seen the Father also. And since of the increase of his government and peace and manifestation there is to be no end, so also of his revelation there shall be no limit.

J. F. Schaffer

ART. VIII. THE PLACE OF THE BIBLE IN LUTHER'S TIME.

THE century of the Reformation is, for the student, a most fascinating one. In many respects it is the most thrilling of all the Christian centuries. Great thoughts stirred in men's minds. Horizons of truth were vastly, though dimly, widening. Heroic achievements were keeping pace with these broadening visions. It was the era known as the *Renaissance*, when the intellect of Europe awoke, as it were, from a long sleep and, groping round, found within its reach the opulent treasures of the knowledge and philosophy of the classic East. This was one of the necessary preliminaries leading up to the great reform, and must always be considered when Luther's work is under discussion. Had it not been for the precedent enfranchisement of intellect there would have been no subsequent freedom of soul. The revival of learning was the John the Baptist of the Reformation, and prepared the way for the deeper spiritual work of the great monk. Roman and Greek literature became the passionate study of the scholars of the period. Diligent search was made for ancient manuscripts, and libraries were multiplied. Throngs of Greek scholars poured into Italy after the fall of Constantinople and brought with them the priceless treasures of ancient Greek literature, science, and art. They and their manuscripts were most cordially welcomed in the universities of Europe, and European intellect was greatly quickened. Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio led the way to this renewed interest in classical learning; and, though it developed in Italy a tendency to irreligion and epicureanism and even to immorality, it gave men the conviction that they had, at least, a right to think, untrammelled and unterrorized by a spiritual hierarchy. It opened the way to skepticism, but at the same time it broke the shackles of intellectual slavery and freed the thinkers of the day from bondage to the schoolmen. In Germany, however, it took a different course, and was permeated by a spirit of religion. Reuchlin, everywhere famous as a scholar and second only to Erasmus, considered his Hebrew grammar his greatest work. Erasmus was a veritable Corypheus of learning, and, with Colet and More

of England, quickened in a most marked degree the currents of thought which were flowing against the Roman hierarchy, though unfortunately for his future fame he was not of the stuff that heroes are made of. As Professor Fisher says, "His writings and the reception accorded to them show that the European mind had outgrown the existing ecclesiastical system and was ready to break loose from its control." It was the era of great universities, and more than sixty of these were attempted or established before the year 1500. They were attended, even singly, by thousands of students, and the light of knowledge was spread abroad.

The Crusades, also, whose primal object was to rescue an empty tomb from the hands of the Saracens, lent powerful assistance, though unthought of by their projectors, to the seething movements of European thought, in that they gave to intelligent men participating in them a knowledge of other lands, of other schools of thought, and of other modes of living, and thus made way for a hospitable reception to variant theories of truth and life. We must also remember that it was an age of geographical discovery, when the boundaries of the world were marvelously extended and a virgin continent, seat of future empires and noblest civilization, rose from the stormy billows of the Atlantic and gave to Columbus a deathless immortality. Vasco da Gama, John and Sebastian Cabot, and others rapidly enlarged men's knowledge of the earth; while in the year in which Columbus died Copernicus, emancipated from authority, attained the knowledge of the true theory of the solar system. The powerful aid which the new art of printing furnished the Reformation is not to be overlooked. This gave its leaders facilities for immensely multiplying their writings, and they were quick to utilize this medium of communication with the people. Great printing houses, which exist to this day, were founded, and before the year 1500 more than ten thousand editions of books and pamphlets had been published. Versions of the Bible were printed in most of the European languages in the early part of the sixteenth century, and these stimulated the great reform.

Other impelling forces cooperating with Luther in establishing the Reformation were (1) providential circumstances, such as changes in rulers, both political and ecclesiastical,

changes of tactics on the part of the papacy, and frictions of ambitious ecclesiastics; and (2) powerful associates, who, while frequently and seriously differing with him on doctrinal points, contributed on the whole, in a most marked degree, to the success of the movement. These were Melancthon and Zwingli and Farel and Reuchlin, and, in a measure, Erasmus, Maximilian, Frederick of Saxony, Franz von Sickingen, Ulrich von Hutten, and others not necessary to mention. But Luther was the head and front of the whole movement, on whom fell the thunderbolts of papal wrath and without whom the movement would in all probability have failed, as did those of Huss in Bohemia and Wyclif in England. The spirit of the Reformation was incarnated in Luther. He was God's central messenger, charged with a sublime and world-influencing task. He was the Moses of the Christian Church, as was the lawgiver of the Israelitish Church, commissioned to lead God's people out of the slavery of ecclesiasticism and human dogmas imposed upon the world by an apostate hierarchy.

The place of the Bible in the movement which he so largely represented may be estimated in part from the place it occupied in his own experience. In the inner life of his own soul were the insuppressible fountains of reform. He, like others, was held in his earlier years under the bondage of salvation by works, and expresses himself in these touching words: "I had a broken spirit and was ever in sorrow. I wore out my body in vigils and fastings, and hoped thus to satisfy the law and deliver my conscience from the sting of guilt." He took upon himself monastic vows, that he might have the greater opportunity to placate with personal suffering and sacrifice the wrath of God, and declares that had not light come to him he could not have lived two years longer. But deliverance was not far away; and through an old monk's calling his attention to the phrase in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins," and still more by judicious counsel given him by John Staupitz and by the study of Tauler and Augustine, and most of all by a journey to Rome, the scales fell from his eyes. On his homeward journey as he pondered the words, "The just shall live by faith," their full meaning burst upon him. He says, "Through the Gospel that righteousness is revealed which avails before God, by which he, out of grace and mere compassion, justifies us

through faith. "Here I felt at once," he continues, "that I was wholly born again and that I had entered through open doors into paradise itself. That passage of Paul was truly to me the gate of paradise."

This new conception of salvation, as being not by the works of the law, but by the hearing of faith, was the Magna Charta of Luther's personal freedom. He entered into the liberty wherewith Christ makes free, independently of all ecclesiastical rites, ceremonies, and superstitions; and he found himself the possessor of spiritual emancipation without the intercession or intervention of pope, cardinal, bishop, or priest, and without fasting, flagellation, penance, or purgation. Here was the germinal seed of the Reformation; and this truth obtained from the Bible was destined to revolutionize the creed and character of Christendom. Luther glowed with zeal to unfold the truth of salvation and to declare it and impress it upon his young pupils and his congregation at Wittenberg. "The simple word of God," says the intrepid monk of Erfurt, "with its sublime evangelical truths, must be freed from the sophistries woven round it by man and be made accessible to all without distinction. To make the soul live and be good and free there is nothing else in heaven or on earth but the Holy Scriptures. In this word the soul has perfect joy, happiness, peace, light, and all good things in abundance." This apprehension of God's word made Luther a strong, virile, and powerful personality—heroic, well poised, clear-thoughted, and God-dependent.

He did not, however, at once see the logical content of his new experience. It was, indeed, difficult to quickly pass from midnight to midnoon. As in the natural world time must be allowed for great principles to work themselves out from seed to flower and from flower to fruit, so this vital principle which Luther had discovered lay for a while inchoate in his mind as to its broader application to ecclesiastical systems and customs. "I am one of those," he says, "who have gradually advanced by writing and teaching, not of those who at a single bound spring to perfection out of nothing." But circumstances and providential events were quickly ripening the reformatory thoughts of the age, and Luther, in his reflections on the trend of events and upon the actions of his opponents, compelling the examination of sources of authority, was forced by irresistible

logic and moral sequence to take the position which he finally did, that the Bible alone was the ultimate authority, and that all powers, whether of bishops, cardinals, councils, or popes, must be derivative from, and amenable to, the word of God.

This was the citadel of the Reformation, intrenched in which it fought its battle to the end. It is the central principle of Protestantism, and is well expressed by a celebrated English writer, Chillingworth: "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants." In every disputation, whether with Miltitz, or Eek, or Cajetan, in his direct appeals to pope and to people, and in his printed discussions of the questions at issue, Luther planted himself firmly and immovably on this fundamental principle. In that most dramatic, historic, and inspiring scene—paralleled only, if paralleled at all, by that of Moses at the court of Pharaoh—before the Diet of Worms, to which he was summoned by imperial rescript, and where he was surrounded by all the magnificence of both regal and ecclesiastical courts, he reaches an immortal climax of utterance and declares his unchangeable conclusion: "Unless, therefore, I am convinced by the testimony of Scripture or by the clearest reasoning, . . . I am persuaded by the passages I have quoted, and my conscience is bound by the word of God. I cannot and I will not retract, for it is unsafe for a Christian to speak against his conscience." And then follow those words which, like a bugle blast, thrilled all Germany and have living power in them still, "*Hier stehe ich; ich kann nicht anders. Gott helfe mir*"—"Here I stand; I can do no other. God help me!"

In recognition of this potential truth as it related itself to the accumulated rubbish and admitted corruption of the Roman Church, the pope and his vassals addressed themselves to the task of crushing both the man and the movement centering in him. The civil and military, as well as the ecclesiastical, authorities were invoked against him. The emperor, Charles V, issued an edict citing all persons, on pain of the ban of the empire, to refuse to harbor him, or to feed him, or to give him drink, or to furnish him succor in any way, secretly or publicly, but to seize him wherever he might be found and bring him to the imperial presence. He also ordered that his books should be confiscated and burned and that his adherents should be apprehended, confined, and their goods confiscated.

Such a decree filled the hierarchy with joy, and they anticipated a speedy deliverance of the Church from the troublesome monk and thought the end of the tragedy was near. But the movement was in the Church, in the people, and in the age, and, though Luther had perished on the scaffold or on the rack, the cause he represented, though possibly delayed, would have gone on to certain triumph.

All waves of human power dashed ineffectually against this rock-based man, and even in their seeming victory only afforded him, in his retirement at the Wartburg, an opportunity to secure a firmer hold upon the eternal rock by the translation of the Bible into the German vernacular, and then, by its dissemination, to defeat forever the possibility of again binding the Germanic people with hierarchical claims of priestly tradition or prelatical assumptions. An open Bible had now become the safeguard of spiritual freedom. The way into the holy of holies was again unincumbered, and every man, prince or peasant, wise or otherwise, could come with boldness direct to God. The multitudes gladly availed themselves of this reinforcement to their faith. Gieseler* tells us that as soon as Luther's version of the New Testament circulated in northern and middle Germany it caused a vast vibration in all ranks and orders of society. Even shoemakers and women read it with feverish eagerness, committed parts to memory, and carried the volume in their bosoms. Boys outstripped veteran theologians in their power to quote from it, and the common people were permeated with its power. Even the approved Catholic translations of the Bible are dependent on Luther's text.†

By this return to the Bible the pulpit was revitalized. Preaching during the Middle Ages had grown less and less frequent, and the quality of the sermons had become more and more insipid and unspiritual. Forms of worship had become stereotyped and were emptied of all spiritual energy or power. Instead of the great truths of Scripture being considered, the priests held up some manufactured saint or some founder of a monastic or mendicant order and thus fed the people on the husks of Church tradition and Church dignitaries. But the resurrected Bible changed all this, and warmth and life and

* *Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. v, p. 284, Latin footnote.

† See article in *Methodist Review* for May-June, 1885.

power characterized the preaching of the reformers. Multitudes flocked to hear them as they expounded the Scriptures. Having their own hearts aglow with the newly discovered and powerfully stimulating truth, they were filled with unction, and, without bell or book or candle, in free and direct address, they preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Their example retroacted upon the mother Church, and various orders of preaching friars, as the Theatines and Barnabites, were established by the Roman Catholic authorities. They sought, by the adoption of this method, to stem the tide that was sweeping toward Protestantism; and, in a measure, they were successful. In the preaching of the reformers Jesus Christ was exalted to his rightful place as the sole and only way of salvation. The Virgin Mary was dethroned from her false position as sharing with her Son the mediatorial throne. Saints who had been canonized and martyrs who had been exalted to the office of intercessors and thrust in between the worshiper and Christ were remanded back to their true place, as being, indeed, worthy of reverence, but none the less sinners saved by grace.

Not only did the pulpit take on new power, but the newly discovered Bible became the mother of a new religious literature. Commentaries, sermons, catechisms, Church histories, popular tracts, and treatises on vexed questions issued rapidly from the press and became sources of popular instruction and feeders of the awakened spiritual aspirations of men. These informed and strengthened the people in their convictions that religion was a personal matter, that no benefits accrued from another's superabundant goodness, and that none could be delivered from purgatory through vicarious values. A new hymnology, also, warm, spiritual, and vital, sprang out of this new faith, embodying in verse which was sung through Germany the simple doctrines of the word of God. As much, perhaps, as anything else, these glorious hymns carried the truth of God deep down into the convictions and hearts of men and supported them in their troubles. Even Luther himself contributed to this form of gospel propagation, and his magnificent metrical paraphrase of the forty-sixth Psalm, beginning "*Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*," is still the joy, and has become a religious classic, of the German people. At a

council of the Roman Catholic cardinals in opposition to Luther one of them said, "Luther by his songs has conquered us."

It would be exceeding the appointed limits of this article to develop the relation of the Bible to modern civilization, but that it holds a regnant position there none will deny. 1. It has certainly established the true ethical standard of human conduct, both for individuals and nations. 2. It has been the revealer of, and the inspiration to, the possession of individual liberty, until slavery, hounded to its death, hides its loathsome head in the depths of Africa. 3. It steadily tends to the removal of legal, political, and social inequalities of human relations; and ultimately the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, taught so clearly in its pages, will be the law of a common humanity. This imperial book can never lose its place in the van of all political, social, and religious movements looking to the amelioration of the ills of mankind and the establishment of righteous relations among the children of men. It is God's Magna Charta in the interests of moral and spiritual freedom, not wrung from a tyrannical ruler by the rough hands of armed barons in open and triumphant rebellion, but freely given by a sovereign Father, sealed and sanctified in the blood of a redeeming Saviour, and consecrated for evermore by the sufferings, sacrifices, and heroic martyrdoms of myriads who have marched with it to the flames, the rack, and to pitiless beasts of prey. Our inheritance is a noble one. We owe it to the ages to come to preserve the liberty of free perusal and individual interpretation till time shall be no more; to impersonate its character, absorb its spirit, express its purpose, be living object lessons of its power, and illustrate in our own lives that indeed "the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. . . . And in keeping of them there is great reward."

John D. Pickles

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

THE statement on page 950 of the last number of the *Review*, that, aside from Frederick Merrick, Joseph Cummings nearly doubles in years of educational work any president the colleges of our Church ever had, requires to be corrected. Dr. Herman A. Koch has been an educator thirty-six years, twenty-two years as president of Central Wesleyan College at Warrenton, Mo.; and Dr. William F. King, now president of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Ia., an institution of great usefulness and wide influence, with five hundred and fifty students and twenty-eight in its faculty, became professor of ancient languages in Ohio Wesleyan University in 1857, acting president of Cornell College in 1862, and president in 1865, making thirty-seven years of educational service, thirty-two as president.

WHEN Emerson read that haleyon, flamboyant, and tipsy work of fiction, Abbott's *Napoleon Bonaparte*, his sarcastic comment was, "It seems that the chief object of Bonaparte's life was to establish Sunday schools throughout Europe." We are now in the midst of a literary and artistic *renaissance* of Napoleonism. The advertisement of one firm calls it, with unconscious propriety and precision, a "revival of the Napoleonic legend." Book-stores and picture-stores ring and blaze with Napoleon. D. Appleton & Company issue *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Napoleon I*, by Baron de Méneval, private secretary to Napoleon. G. P. Putnam's Sons offer a translation of Dumas' *Napoleon*, now first rendered into English. J. B. Lippincott Company publish Frederick Masson's books, *Napoleon at Home* and *Napoleon and the Women of his Court*, as also Thiers' *History of the Consulate and the Empire of France*. The Merriam Company print *Masson's Napoleon, Lover and Husband*. The *Century Magazine* and *McClure's Magazine* are running the life of Napoleon in serial. The *North American Review* announces twelve chapters on the later and lesser Napoleonism in "The Personal History of the Second Empire." The Werner Company advertise a pictorial

album containing hundreds of pictures illustrating the career of "Napoleon from Corsica to St. Helena." In addition, the theme is on the pages of many newspapers. And the epidemic is more widespread than there is here space to indicate. Fads and crazes are characteristic of human life, and this one is now having its "innings," alongside of the chrysanthemum. Both are showy and unfragrant; one of them is noxious.

This revival is not born of a Pentecost of wisdom or virtue, and is not a happy omen. If we need martial heroes to worship modern history is not so beggarly poor that Napoleon is its best. The English-speaking world can surely and easily do better. One hero there is who, by a distinct token, belongs to all mankind. His name was Gordon. When Bonaparte, the "man of destiny," died, after making Europe a slaughterhouse, his life going out in smoke and ashes like an untended watchfire on St. Helena, the anathemas of many nations gnashed and hissed behind him as he descended to meet the fierce welcome of a million men whom he had sent before him to hades, down the red and slippery slopes of battle. When Chinese Gordon's life was known to be in peril special prayers were offered in all lands that the boon of his safety might be granted by a merciful Heaven to the human race, from time immemorial sorely in need of such as he; fervent prayers were put up at many altars of the Greek Church, in churches Roman Catholic and Protestant in Europe and America, in the pagan temples of China; and, what was never done before or since for a Christian, official supplications for the same inestimable favor were presented at the most sacred shrine of Mecca by the whole Mohammedan world.

General Charles George Gordon, braver far than Bonaparte, was as pure and noble a human character as ever purified and perfumed the air of earth by breathing it or consecrated the soil by treading it. Yet he sometimes suffers disparagement, even in Christian circles, and is denominated a "crank." By worldly standards he was a crank, as was also Jesus Christ. When Gordon died—a hero, a saint, a martyr—at Khartoum, not a human being on earth but was in some way impoverished by the universal bereavement. Would it be an inordinate memorial to name a planet after him? Men will not do this; but they cannot, by withholding it, prevent him from shining forever in the heavens.

Fairness requires that this blast of orchestral trumpets around Napoleon's feet shall not last too long, for in the chill anteroom of history the shivering shades of Judas Iscariot, Nero, Torque-

mada, Genghis Khan, and a crowd of similar worthies are waiting each his turn to be called before the footlights to receive his own proper and logical ovation from the gaping galleries, full of the worshipers of strutting vanity, insanely inordinate ambition, domineering selfishness, conscienceless duplicity, and all manner of fraud and devilry in the theater of shams.

THE MERCENARY SPIRIT IN PUBLIC LIFE.

If ever the good citizen loses hope for his country it is when he is forced to confront the ravages made by the mercenaries of public life. All other evils and dangers are face to face with effective checks; ignorance is confronted with a growing system of public education; sectional differences are softened by increase of common interests and travel; capital and labor controversies cannot pass far beyond the lines where they menace labor with hunger and capital with deficits; religious animosities have passed out of the list of dangers through the growth of a truly Christian spirit. But to the rapacity of the political mercenary there is no known limit. Political divisions were once a check; the dishonest or extravagant party could be voted out; but "the cohesive power of public plunder" overweights the cohesiveness of party loyalty, and the plunder of the public is oftenest effected by a "combine" sitting astride of party fences.

Not the least of the perplexities created by the mercenary spirit is the nearly universal belief in its prevalence and the ready credence given to charges of corruption, and the appalling magnitude of the alleged crimes against the public's pocketbook. Out of the faith, if we may not say the credulity, of the people in this general reign of the public thief there has come the mercenary occupation of exposing mercenaries. The printing of a newspaper to unmask the financial debaucheries of public men is sometimes as profitable as public theft can possibly be; and so it happens that in the press and on the stump the paid assassin of character is sure of an applauding audience and of satisfactory compensation in money. Recklessness of assertion, indifference to any sacredness in veracity, the most astounding mendacity in dealing with statistical facts, and clamorous conscientiousness of a professional sort—these are some of the wearisome faults of the sleuthhound let loose upon the track of the mercenaries. It would be bad enough if these profitable hunts for fraud were confined to the illiterate or half-literate class of journals and

orators; but it is made nearly intolerable by the participation in it by organs of culture and by gentlemen of education.

The perplexity caused by mercenary attacks upon mercenaries, by the profitableness of the business of exposing other mercenaries, goes down to the very bottom of the evil; it creates a doubt, as a reaction from fevered positiveness, whether there be any public scoundrels, or it fills one with despair of the life of a nation so awfully corrupt, or it suggests the folly of seeking for guidance among those who offer to lead us. If a man gains money by rashly denouncing other men as thieves, will he not steal when his turn comes to handle public money? Of all professional forms of virtue that of honesty is the most indelicate and the least trusted; sobriety of experience warns us that the man who accuses all other men is probably himself unsafe; and when his accusatorial profession is profitable we are almost certain that he may be as expert in theft as he is in lying. In short, we have no fair chance to know the exact truth about public frauds, and we cannot trust the high priests of public purity—those who allege that they fill this high office. It would seem to follow that we can only sit idly by while public and private interests are recklessly gambled away or cunningly filched away, having neither sense, knowledge, nor trustworthy human instruments of punishment or of reformation. This despair is, however, not justified upon a survey of our whole case. To go back to the root of it, the mercenary spirit is itself a product, a growth out of our human soil; and this growth can be restrained, if not altogether checked, by the cultivation of a better spirit. In public and private life alike the moral temper and trend are subject to an effectual measure of control by education, by public opinion, and by the religious life of the people. If the mercenary spirit is largely developed it is because neither education nor public opinion nor religion have effectually resisted it. Indeed, we have hardly yet awakened in school room, press, and pulpit to the necessity of resisting the rank and poisonous growths of the mercenary spirit, and we have in all these organs of the American conscience tolerated some doctrines which of their own force must make public service mercenary. A change of front respecting these doctrines would mean a widespread array of resistance to the evil thing. It is quite possible to keep the nation sweet, or even to make it sweet, by plain and simple truths as old as Christianity, nay, as old as civilization. What these truths are we can best see through a survey of the moral heresies of our time.

1. We have as Americans tolerated, if we have not taught, the doctrine that for a public service a citizen should receive as much as private service would yield him, or more than it would yield him. Two great facts are in evidence. One is the common complaint of cultured journalism that we pay good judges pitifully small salaries; and in the same organs of opinion there is a kind of standing demand that public service of all sorts shall be more highly paid. By force of a curious moral obliquity the same organs are sworn enemies of the mercenaries who prey upon the people. The other great fact is that the eternal scramble for offices is plainly caused by the relatively higher rewards of public life. The office is a prize, it offers a distinct financial gain. And it seems never to have occurred to the enemies of "the spoils system" that the easy and, indeed, the only remedy is to abolish the spoils.

The brilliant day of old Greece was made for it, not by statesmen or poets, but by the wholesome spirit of its public games. The greater Greece which envelops even us, and even now, grew out of the spirit animating those contests. The struggle of this spirit was for the excellent, for the best, whether in athletics or in aesthetics; and the crowned runner, poet, or orator represented to the whole nation some pinnacle of human achievement toward which all Greek eyes were turned by the victory. And to this victor what spoil was given? A bundle of parsley, a few sprigs of pine or of wild olive! That was absolutely the whole material reward for a victory which made a whole kingdom or province proud of its champion, which lifted a family up into distinction, which set the noblest tasks for Greek art. At the very time when its noble life accepted a handful of leaves as a prize the whole people's public life was being assassinated by bands of mercenaries in political life. The analogy is easily seen. There has been an awful force at work in our American life to build into us the mercenary conception of reward—the force of the general and painful poverty of our people down to about 1840 or 1850. All social tracts have suffered and still suffer from the commercial estimate—all the way from the generic "It pays" to the interrogative "What does it pay you to preach?" But no one doubts that we have kept some clean spots, and that for nobler things than Greek athletic or æsthetic we have traditions and ideals of noble striving. High character, noble service, whether conspicuous or not, command a reward more highly prized than gold. Our very practical problem is to extend this

spirit of high service into public life; it is the problem of the political world whenever popular institutions offer the poor citizen a chance to plunder the rich citizen, or *vice versâ*. We have—and may we long keep!—a conspicuous success in our national Supreme Court. There, at least, the money reward is not even so much as a poor half of the compensation. We pay these men chiefly in honor—in that for which the crown of wild olives stood in Greek feeling. But why is there a perpetual scramble for positions, post offices, and city clerkships? Mainly because every such office means a prize quite unlike a bunch of parsley; because the money reward is in excess of that for like service in private relations or, at least, in excess of the wages the aspirants could earn in private service. This excess of money reward is, of course, freely denied; but the plain citizen knows only too well why men desire public office. And where the mercenary spirit is so systematically cultivated there is small wonder that the olive crown is little regarded and has a diminishing worth. We cannot hope for the best service, hardly for clean service, so long as the salary shuts out of view the honors of office.

2. Another heresy abundantly taught is that any species of public work should be paid for with money; and especially that to interest oneself in an election and to promote the success of a principle is to earn money—to be paid with a salaried office. And, therefore, whenever a devout citizen approaches the altars of his country to lay this kind of patriotic sacrifice upon them, he finds the altars hemmed in by mercenaries who wonder aloud, "What does this fellow want?" A certain suspicion attaches to all kinds of political effort, as though one must have a corrupt interest in any political action. We need to vindicate for those who value the olive crown the right to serve without pay and "to spend and be spent" in patriotic service. But even greater is the need of abolishing the prizes. If every public service were, like that of the Supreme Court, a sacrifice of money, rather than a gain of it, a great growth of disinterested service might be expected.

Two objections are urged. "Your plan shuts poor men out of public service." It does not; for a frugal life is not necessarily a thing to be abandoned when one is elected to office, since the election does not increase the breadth of a back to be clothed or the demands of a stomach to be fed. But what if a citizen had to live self-denyingly for years in order to lay in store for a period of public service? Would not this flavor of self-sacrifice impart itself to the bunch of parsley, to the honors of public service? The

other objection to small salaries is that the offices will thus go to small men. Measured by olive crown tests, the small men are already in many offices, and by the same test he is worse than a small man who seeks the salary rather than the service. We need the man who prizes the handful of leaves. He only can render us great service. We are not likely to get him so long as he must scramble with meaner men for meaner rewards.

3. The doctrine that the public ought to pay more for everything than private persons do—and that, therefore, a government contract ought to be a prize—is not so audaciously paraded, but it is as tenaciously held. It implies that the *patria* is something to be plundered. The common belief that a democracy must be expensive is a root out of which mercenary deeds grow, and it is a constant suggestion to the young that the country ought to be prodigal toward them. Uncle Sam is regarded as a sort of Santa Claus.

4. The decadence of the belief that "the office should seek the man" and the open-faced candor with which men seek office—office meaning money nine times in ten—show us a heresy crept into the royal seat of a true doctrine. In a civilization wherein men pick themselves out for lucrative offices and surround the office in such numbers that the people have no power to select the fit, the non-competing man—such a civilization can have small use for laurel and olive leaves of honor. We are rapidly losing the sense that the people choose their servants; and every whiff of fragrance from such service arises out of, not place sought, but honor conferred.

There lie about the roots of the mercenary growths in public life these and other beliefs, doctrines, maxims; and the school, the press, and the pulpit can and must check the mercenary in public affairs by teaching sound doctrine. It is not this or that "reform" which can lift our public life into the nobility of the olive crown; in fact, many schemes to redeem the nation from evil are only forms of the activity of the mercenary spirit. The thing yet unattained and as yet scarcely dreamed of, much less aspired to, is to give to public life the power, manliness, and far-reaching glory of the Greek games, made more glorious by Christian conceptions of the highest things in service. This disgraceful public life, made shameful by greed and plunder, is not to be externally molded into moral comeliness and refined into moral clearness by any trick of ballot boxes. The reform must be inward, searching, spiritual, divine. In bulk, public life is as

clean as the heart of the whole people. It will cease to be corrupted by the mercenary spirit when that spirit is cast out of American life. The highest civil function, the most patriotic duty, the divinest service of the dear motherland is to build a better manhood; and that will redeem us. Nothing less than that manhood deserves our confidence as a check to the mercenary savagery and barbarism of political life.

WHAT IS WORLDLINESS?

"IN the world, but not of it," has long been recognized as a very fitting statement of the true Christian's proper position. But as to just what this embraces and how the maxim is to be practically applied people are not so generally agreed. Mistakes are constantly made in two ways. Some mingle overmuch with the world. Others mingle not enough. There is a right way and a wrong way of being in the world. A few distinctions seem to be necessary.

What is the "world" against conformity with which we are repeatedly warned, and whose friendship is represented as incompatible with the love of God? It is a convenient phrase to designate the great mass of the world's inhabitants, those who are content to live for the passing moment and the outward show, those who are absorbed in the things that are seen and walk in the ways of their own evil hearts. The worldling is one who follows the multitude, not presuming to differ in his manner of life from those that are most closely about him. Worldliness is the spirit that takes and keeps possession of the vast majority of people everywhere, the spirit whose chief mark is attachment to the external and the transitory, in distinction from the internal and eternal.

This world spirit has many forms of manifestation, just as the divine spirit has, differing widely in different ages, lands, and persons. In a rude, barbaric age the distinctive spirit of the world is brute force. In another land or time the leading element of worldliness would be idolatry and its accompanying licentiousness. With us, in these days of high civilization, when material comforts are so multiplied and society has such complex organization, the spirit of the world is chiefly greed of gain. Furthermore, in the same age and country what is preeminently the world to one man will not so fully represent it to another. The merchant has his world—a set of competitors with whom he

contents, a set of patrons for whom he caters, a set of ideas and maxims and customs by which he feels bound because they are those that rule in his immediate circle. But the minister has a very different world, with a very different set of maxims and customs and, hence, a very different set of temptations; while the world of the politician or the workingman would be of quite another sort. And for one in either of these classes to really live above the world it would be essential that he live above his world, not somebody else's. For lack of recognizing this it is very possible for a man to be very worldly without realizing it. He may take to himself much false credit because he feels no drawing toward a certain something which he has got accustomed to calling the world, but which is not at all the world to him, not by any means the antagonist with which he is called to fight. One will occasionally find the man of sixty congratulating himself that he has been lifted by grace above any desire for worldly amusements, meaning by that term certain things which have a fascination for the youth of twenty, while he is entirely oblivious to the firm grip which the world in the form of covetousness has upon him.

We know of no better way to define in general terms the temptation to worldliness than to call it the impulse to be as good as the average of those most immediately in contact with us, whether they be schoolmates, shopmates, tradesmen, church members, ministers, or what not. He only is unworldly who resolves to live alone, who dares to be better than his nearest and accidental associates, who keeps before him a standard which is not that of the average of his own set, but something higher. Loneliness and unworldliness go together. The Christian is one who stands apart, who dares to differ. Solitude stamps the saint. But it is of the utmost importance to remember that there is a wrong way and a right way of living alone. We can live alone after the hermit fashion, or we can live alone after the hero fashion. The hermit idea has had a wide following in the Church from very early days. Gnosticism, which crept in even before the apostle John died, taught the sinfulness of matter, fostered asceticism, and led men to imagine that there was merit in a rigorous austerity of life. Later on, the terrible corruptions of the age induced many to feel that they could not maintain their virtue without escaping from the heathen cities in which they dwelt, and even from the churches, which had become much demoralized, and fleeing to the deserts. Still later, the hermits, for better

discipline and protection, were gathered into companies and became monks. And finally were organized the great monastic orders, still prominently figuring in the Roman Catholic branch of the Christian Church.

The thought at the bottom of all this seems to have been that a specially religious life must differ very widely in all outward respects from the ordinary life of common society; that if one wanted to be particularly pious the less he resembled at any point those who were not so the better. External acts and forms and ceremonies and special exercises, rather than the inward spirit of the man, were made the main test of godliness. The hermit idea of getting away from the world, that is, away from much physical contact with those who are not godly, away from much resemblance of any kind to those who are living only for the present, still greatly prevails. Many people are apt to think there is something wicked in pretty nearly all things that mark a refined and highly civilized community, that the more they abandon the goods of this life the more spiritual they are likely to be, and that the less they have to make earth attractive the better fitted they will prove for the heavenly mansions. Which is all a very great mistake. There is certainly no special virtue in poverty, any more than in celibacy. Dirt is not godliness, nor is ignorance. However illiterate, uncouth, or unfamiliar with the spelling book and the bath tub a man may be, it does not particularly recommend him to the Most High.

Need there is of emphasizing the thought that it is not by withdrawing from the world or differing with it in any outward sense that we are to conquer it, but by living in the world, in most respects as the world, and from higher motives than the world knows. Few can be ignorant that it is the intention behind the act which determines whether the actor should have praise or blame. For the very same deed can be done from a principle of righteousness or from unprincipled selfishness. It will appear the same to careless eyes, which see only the outward; but in God's sight the two things are as wide apart as possible. Two men, for example, are making money; the one a Christian, the other a worldling. Is it not perfectly plain that in most of the steps they take for the enlargement of their trade and the increase of their profits they must do precisely the same things? Nine tenths of their transactions in outward aspect will be exactly alike. In what way, then, does the godly man stand alone? In the spirit and nature which are underneath the outward. He is working for God, instead of self.

He has consecrated his business abilities to the Lord just as conscientiously as the commentator has consecrated his scholarly abilities. He is gathering wealth for the good of the Church and the uplifting of humanity. He is an example of uprightness, truthfulness, honor, and genuine kindness in the driving marts of trade. And all who come in contact with him know him for a Christian merchant. Surely, that is every way better than creeping away to some obscure spot, there to bury his talents in the earth and spend his time writing pious, but useless, books or groaning over the evils of the age. The latter proceeding would be that of a fool and a coward. It would be a manifest running away from the post of danger and duty. It would be about like committing suicide, instead of bravely shouldering the burdens of existence, whatever they might be. It would be throwing away a life which might have been used to grand purpose.

Not the hermit fashion, but the hero fashion, of living alone is the true one. What is a hero? He is a man of courage and power, a strong man who can lead, not shirking pain or peril to carry forward a worthy cause. He is a man of great soul, who never strikes his flag to fear, who bears himself loftily and walks serenely after the counsel of his own bosom, careless of pleasing. He is not under bondage to received opinion, nor given to apologies and petty prudences. He is at open war with falsehood and wrong, ready at all times, taking in his hand both reputation and life, to defy the mob and dare the gibbet for that which is true and right. This is the attitude which we call heroic—the only attitude fit for a Christian. The Christian must be a hero, a man of martial spirit, who feels that he belongs to the Church militant and is called to fight, being a follower of Him who said, "I came not to send peace, but a sword." He who gets fully possessed of this thought will never think of slinking off because the combat is difficult. We are not to run away from the world for fear of getting contaminated with it—that is wholly unworthy of our high vocation; more power is needed. They who separate themselves so rigidly from those about them make plain confession that they are too weak to stand before the temptations which would assail them. It is a confession which neither honors them nor their Lord. He is well able to keep them and make them to stand if they will but trust him and manfully go forward.

Greater aggressiveness on the part of the Church is the chief demand of the hour. It is no wonder that it takes one hundred Christians a whole year to convert one sinner if they occupy all

the time guarding themselves against his approaches. The Church should take vigorous possession of all the things that are not intrinsically evil; should lay hold of all the innocent forms of modern life and fill them with holy influence. She should live so close to Jesus that she can go forth in his spirit and power and capture the positions of the enemy.

It will not do for her to say, for example, that politics is such a filthy pool that Christians cannot meddle with it. She must not leave the government of this country, which is God's country, to be managed by the lowest elements of the community. A bad citizen, one who does not do his rightful part in shaping the policy of the administration, cannot be a good Christian. If the church members of the land had the heroism to assert themselves as they should we should not see the pitiful spectacle of universal subserviency to the saloon as we do now.

A great many Christians are also shirking social duties because they do not feel strong enough to take them up. They are afraid, if they have anything to do with them, that they will be swept off their feet and carried into sin. Surely, this is pitiful! That Christians, after living ten, twenty, thirty years with Jesus, have got so little of his love in their hearts that they have to sit around and nurse it and spend all their time looking after it, instead of being at leisure from self and able to help other people, is positively disgraceful. Jesus went freely into society, mingling in marriages and other feasts, with the one purpose of doing good. So should we.

The religion that has to be handled with extreme tenderness, lest it get irretrievably smashed or smirched, is not of a very robust sort. How are we to get people saved unless we can take part with them in things that they are interested in, and show them in ways that they can understand that we have a spiritual power which they do not possess? Aggressiveness on the part of Christians is surely the crying need of the age—ability to do something more than hold the fort and fill up the vacancies made in the ranks by death. Separation from the world after the hero fashion, and not after the hermit fashion, is demanded. There must be a faith vigorous enough to overcome the world, not by beating a retreat before it, but by advancing upon it; a faith that brings God so near and makes eternity so real that the things of time and sense cease to mean much and lose their power. This faith is the stuff that heroes are made of; and heroic religion is the only kind that God has much use for in these days.

THE ARENA.

THE PECCABILITY OF JESUS.

IN the "Arena" of the July *Review* one of your correspondents makes "A Point in Theology." He says, "I am a believer in the impeccability of Christ, and consider this position in harmony with the teaching of Scripture and fundamental in Methodist theology." As I see it, the Christ he presents to the world is of no value to me, because if his position is true his Christ never lived on the plane where I live and never met any of the foes that lie in wait along my pathway. If to believe in the perfect humanity of Jesus is to be in sympathy with Socinianism, to advocate his impeccability is to be in active cooperation with necessitarianism. If Jesus represents Adam before the law, his humanity must possess the same qualities and possibilities as the human nature it represents.

In the system of redemption, in order that God may be just and the justifier of all who believe, he must vindicate himself before the world. He must demonstrate to angels and men that his administration toward Adam was just. Before the divine administrator can justly punish Adam or any of his descendants he must demonstrate that Adam could, and therefore he ought to, have kept inviolate his Edenic state. There is but one way in which he could do that—by placing in the world a being with the same constituent qualities of manhood and the same susceptibilities and possibilities before the law, and to let him, without constraint, pass triumphantly where the other was surprised and fell. Therefore, if Jesus represents Adam before the law, everything that the humanity of Adam could do, enjoy, or suffer the human nature of Jesus could equally do, enjoy, or suffer.

If it be logically true that the greater always contains or implies the lesser, then, as certainly as physical death is the sequence of sin and the ultimate climax of the tragedy in Eden, and inasmuch as the Saviour's human body did suffer death upon the cross, all the minor sequences of sin were possible to him. And as certainly as that death was accomplished in him, that he absolutely died—was dead—then all the lesser events and incidents of humanity might have been executed or experienced by him. Jesus could not have been the High Priest of humanity, could not have been "touched with the feeling of our infirmities" and "in all points tempted like as we are," if he had not possessed the same tripartite humanity that we possess—soul and body and spirit; he could not have been the Saviour of the world if he had yielded to temptation, actuated the possibilities that existed in him, and so sinned; nor could he have demonstrated his fitness to die for man if he had not triumphantly passed where Adam was assaulted and defeated.

The humanity of Christ was not mongrel; it was pure, untainted humanity. He was "made of a woman, made under the law," and was therefore

capable of any act that pertains to humanity under law. The divine nature of Jesus was not degraded in the incarnation, and the human nature was not deified. He was not a demigod. The obligations of Jesus, the joys and sufferings of the Son of Mary, were all within the arena of human activities. The union of the two natures was hypostatic—they were not intermingled. It is not conceivable that Deity should suffer. In this hypostatic union, this incarnation of the Son of God, there is demonstrated the complete reconciliation of the alienated parties, there is revealed unto us the place where God and his erring children meet in perfect fellowship; and for thirty-three years these two natures dwelt together in the most perfect harmony.

The facts of Christ's life and death demonstrate (1) that sin is not a necessary adjunct of human nature, and (2) that it was not necessary for Christ to prove his ability to sin by sinning; for he shows himself stronger than any necessitated being. But it was necessary that his conflict with the enemy should be real and his victory complete, or there could be no significance in his sympathy with man nor any certainty of help in time of trial. But now Christ, having had a real conflict and having conquered everywhere, is able to succor them that are tempted, and humanity is triumphant whenever it really enters into Christ's victory. If by any means Christ is removed from the plane on which Adam was created he can be neither an example to humanity nor a redeemer of the race. If he is man's Redeemer his constituent manhood and his legal environments must be those of the humanity for which he suffered and died.

Therefore, we must either accept the moral agency of Jesus, or abandon the moral agency of humanity; for no necessitated being could be an example or redeemer for one who was separated from him by that bridgeless chasm which forever yawns between moral agents and necessitated beings. Since it does not jeopardize the salvation of man or impeach the divinity of Christ, in order to be consistent we must hold to the perfect and unmixed humanity of Jesus, and hence to his peccability, or forever abandon the doctrine of human accountability.

WILLIAM JONES.

Sedalia, Mo.

UNFAIRNESS TO LESSING.

PROFESSOR DAVIES's article on "Nathan the Wise," in the September number of the *Methodist Review*, purports to be a plea for fairness. In the name of fairness I plead against the plea. I would be reluctant to question the conclusions of so able a scholar as Professor Davies, were it not a matter of fact, evident on simple inspection of Lessing's great drama, that he has sadly misread the story of the three rings. I believe the following restatement of the story, containing certain vital points not stated by Professor Davies, will decide the matter one way or the other.

A man in the East owns a priceless ring, the gift of a friend. This ring has a magic power to make the owner beloved of God and man, on condition that he wear it in confidence of its so doing. The ring is passed from father to son through several generations, until it reaches a father of

three sons, any two of whom he is unwilling to grieve by singling out the third as the sole possessor of the ring. To avoid the difficulty he bestows a ring upon each son—upon two of them counterfeit rings, and upon the third the genuine ring—each son believing his own ring to be the true one. The sons quarrel about the matter and go to a judge to decide their claims. The judge reminds the envious brothers that the possessor of the true ring was to be an amiable man and, consequently, that the true ring is probably lost. He then advises them each to strive after uncorrupted, unbiassed love, and summons their children to appear after a thousand years have passed and receive the judgment of a wiser judge.

This is the parable, the three rings standing for the Christian, Jewish, and Mohammedan religions. Is there anything unfair to Christianity in the parable? Professor Davies answers that Lessing's natural conclusion is "that there is no true religion, or if there be, that no one has the power to tell which it is." The *obiter dictum* of the judge—"You are all three deceived deceivers" ("so seit Ihr alle drei betrogene Betrüger")—seems to be warrant for the first alternative; but a reference to the earlier portion of the story makes it clear that the judge had fallen into the same mistake that he leads the professor into. Nathan had explicitly stated that only two of the three rings were false. Nor does Lessing say that the true religion is necessarily indistinguishable, but makes Nathan distinctly say that true religion can be distinguished by the loving character of the possessor. This is just what Christ himself says in John xiii, 35. Why, then, was the judge unable to make the distinction? Because the possessors of the rings had forgotten the condition on which its "hidden virtue" should reveal itself, namely, that it must be worn in confidence of its so doing. The professor seems to be misled here by Nathan's words,

As indistinguishable as, with us,
The true religion.

That is not intended, as it seems when quoted without context, to be a principle applicable to all time, but is the remark made by a Jew to a Mohammedan during the unholy period of the Crusades, when Christendom and Crescentdom were murdering each other without stint and both were making free booty of the hapless Jew; a time when, indeed, an impartial judge, applying the divine love test, might well have believed that neither of the three religions was true. From this we are not to conclude that the true faith is hopelessly indistinguishable, but that Saladin and Nathan and all other sincere adherents of opposing faiths cannot agree in making the distinction.

And least warrantable of all is the conclusion which Professor Davies expresses in the words of Professor Primer: "Lessing, through Nathan, makes it [love] the property of the Mohammedan, Jewish, and Christian religions, when it belongs to Christianity alone." Again, remember that only one ring was genuine, only one religion was to stand the love test. The only suggestion of such an inference as the two professors draw is

the fact that all religions are urged to better themselves by cultivating the character which originally belonged to only one. W. M. BALCH.

Mauston, Wis.

"PUL, JAREB, TIGLATH-PILESER."

THE article on "Pul, Jareb, Tiglath-pileser—A Chronologico-Historical Study," by Dr. Joseph Horner (*Methodist Review*, November-December, 1894, pp. 928, ff.), contains some mistakes which need correction. As they seem to be due to the use of the older books on Assyriology the corrections here set down are accompanied by references to more recent literature. In general it is to be said that the progress of Assyriology has been so rapid as to make the books of George Rawlinson and George Smith already antiquated. The discovery of new inscriptions and the better translations of old ones have set in fresh light many points which these older scholars misunderstood.

1. "The attempt to identify Pul with Porus has not as yet attained to a satisfactory result" (p. 928). On the contrary, this is now absolutely certain. The Ptolemaic Canon for the year 731 reads "Χινζηρος καὶ Πόρον," and the Babylonian King-list A for 731 reads "Ukîn-zîr," and for 728 "Pu-lu" (Winckler, *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1889, p. 147, and Pinches, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1884, p. 193, ff.). It is perfectly plain from a comparison of these two lists that Porus and Pulu are one and the same person. All Assyriologists are agreed that such is the fact. (For a graphic representation of the agreement of the lists of Ptolemy and of the Babylonian King-list and Babylonian Chronicle see Schrader's *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, vol. ii, pp. 290, 291). It may be added that there is no doubt that Pulu and Tiglath-pileser III are the same person. He assumed the latter name when he ascended the throne of Assyria in B. C. 745; and when he became king of Babylon in 729 he was proclaimed under the name Pulu. This act finds parallels in later reigns; for Shalmaneser IV took the name Ululai as king of Babylon, and Ashurbanipal was known as Kandalanu in Babylonia (Rost, *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pileasers III*, Leipzig, 1893, vol. i, p. ix). That Tiglath-pileser III ascended the throne of Babylon at the same time as Pulu and was the same person was finally settled by the cross reference in Babylonian Chronicle B, 84, 2-11, 356, col. i, line 23, where the text reads, "Tukul-ti-apal-e-shar-ra ina Babilu ina Kussû ittasha-ab." (See Winckler, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii, p. 148, ff., and Pinches *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, 1887, xix, p. 655, ff. Also Winckler, *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum A. T.*, Leipzig, 1892, p. 44.)

2. "Asshur-lush (Assur-nerari, Smith) eight years (ten years, Smith)" (p. 928). This ought to be Asshur-nirari III, B. C. 755-745. (See Winckler, *Geschichte Babylonien und Assyriens*, Leipzig, 1892, p. 207.)

3. "Asshur-dayan (Assur-dan Smith) III eighteen years" ought to be Asshur-dan III, B. C. 773-755 (*Ibid.*). It was in his reign in 763 that the eclipse took place which has done so much to fix Assyrian chronology.

4. Of Dr. Horner's main thesis I can only say that I am unable to find any evidence for it in the inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia. I have, since reading his paper, again examined all the existing inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, the Babylonian King-lists and Chronicle, and the Eponym Canon in the original texts, and I have seen no line which gives the least support to his hypothesis; but, on the contrary, all the evidence, direct and indirect, seems to me against it. I regret that this is the fact, for his paper is so interesting, his spirit so fine, and his biblical enthusiasm so generous that one can only regret the apparent failure of his hypothesis. One would be very glad of any assistance in solving the difficult problems of the chronology of the period of the kings which have been stirred up afresh by Assyrian discovery.

Madison, N. J.

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

THE DIFFERENCES OF SCIENTISTS.

SCIENTISTS sometimes gleefully advert to the discrepancies of opinion among theologians as evidence of the uncertainty of human knowledge regarding things divine. It is quite as easy to point out divergencies among the scientists, who deal with matters supposed to be known. Take, for example, some recent opinions regarding the time the earth has been habitable.

Professor Simon Newcomb (*Popular Astronomy*, p. 531) concludes that our globe "has probably been revolving in its orbit ten millions of years; man has probably existed on it less than ten thousand years; civilization less than four thousand"—this, after long calculations as to the rate of the earth's cooling from the incandescent to the habitable state.

Frances Mahaffy (*Sunday School Times*, September 29, 1884, article "Books and Primitive Writing") certainly suggests a much higher antiquity for man. She tells us that to produce merely the "body" of a book, that is, its letters, print, and paper, as apart from its "spirit," has required "the most astonishing efforts of the human mind for certainly more than eight thousand years." She says: "There may now be seen at Oxford a tablet erected by King Sent, of Egypt, with an inscription in memory of his grandson, who died, probably, five thousand [years] before the birth of Christ; and the writing is such as to show that behind it lay a past of almost inconceivable remoteness." She quotes, without dissent, the Phœnician claim of "an antiquity of thirty thousand years;" although she says they "do not appear in history until a comparatively late time." Her frequent use of such terms as "enormously ancient," "after long years," "struggling for ages," and the like, produces the impression of an incalculable antiquity to be assigned to man.

Next comes Professor Drummond, in his new book *The Ascent of Man*, calling for still longer periods. The processes of the evolution of human beings, after the earth had "cooled" sufficiently to sustain life, required "thousands of years for their consummation" (p. 67). "The duration of this process, the profound antiquity . . . are inconceivable by the faculties

of man" (p. 68). It is "the labor and progress of incalculable ages" (p. 66). "For a few thousand years they [the animal forms] reigned supreme, furthered the universal evolution by a hairbreadth, and passed away" (p. 70). Job, Isaiah, and Plato are a "matter of yesterday" in comparison with the beginnings of the human mind (p. 146).

So we have Newcomb, the astronomer, with his ten thousand years, Mahaffy, the philologist, with thirty thousand, and Drummond, the evolutionist, with his periods of human existence absolutely incomputable and inconceivable by any finite intellect whatever. These be thy gods, O Science! Surely the scientists have quite as much need to learn modesty and to cease assuming infallibility as the theologians. J. C. JACKSON.

Jersey City, N. J.

REFORM IS NOT CONVERSION.

THE Saviour said to Nicodemus, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." The expression "born of the flesh" all understand; but "born of the Spirit" is not well understood. All that a man can do for himself religiously is to reform; but he can convert his soul no more than he can change the color of his eyes. God only can convert the soul. Even in the cases of adults whose habits of life have been correct, and to whom, therefore, reform may not be needful, conversion is absolutely necessary for admission into the "kingdom of heaven." Nicodemus, Paul, Cornelius, and the "rich young man" needed conversion, if they did not need reform. The necessity for conversion is based alone upon total depravity. If there be no depravity there can be no conversion; if there be no total depravity there can be no complete conversion.

JASON YOUNG.

St. Paris, O.

CONTINGENT EVENTS.

A WRITER for this department makes this statement: "God can only foreknow contingent events as contingent and uncertain." I fail to understand what is meant by this. If God foreknows an event he must foreknow it as coming to pass. Otherwise he would foreknow an event which might not come to pass, which is an absurdity. If the element of contingency entered into the question, to him it would prevent his foreknowledge. What is contingent to the human mind is not necessarily contingent to the divine mind. Contingency is not an attribute of the future events, but of our finite faculties. That God did foreknow events which to men were contingent is abundantly proved from Scripture. Many of the prophecies of the Old Testament, viewed from a human standpoint, were contingent. But they were literally fulfilled, and so minutely fulfilled that there can be no doubt about the absolute foreknowledge of God. If we deny this absolute foreknowledge we seriously undermine the foundation for the inspiration of the Bible.

North Lansing, N. Y.

B. FRANKLIN.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.**FIDELITY THE PREACHER'S TEST.**

IN the last number of the *Review* attention was called to opportunism in the ministry, in its good and in its bad sense. The subject of this paper is a cognate one and not less important. In the second verse of the fourth chapter of First Corinthians Paul says, "Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful." Differences had arisen in the Corinthian church as to the merits of the most distinguished teachers of the Church, namely, Paul, Apollos, and Cephas. Factions had gathered around these several names, until these distinguished servants of Christ, without their approval and perhaps unknown to all of them, had become in popular estimation the chiefs of ecclesiastical parties. Against these divisions and the party spirit that prompted them the apostle writes with wonderful cogency in the early part of his letter. By disclaiming any desire that a party should gather around him he, by implication, disclaims it for the others: "Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" "Why, then," Paul seems to say, "should a party gather around my name?" It has been noted as a remarkable fact that no Church organization has come down to us bearing these honored names, so effectually did Paul crush this first attempt. In presenting the aspect under which he would have the people regard their leaders he says, in the first verse of the same chapter, "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." He does not emphasize the loyalty of Peter to Hebrew usage, the rhetorical skill and eloquence of Apollos, much less his own rich endowments; but he designates all three as "ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." They are merely the bearers of the sacred mysteries to the world. The requirement in a steward is fidelity, and this he considers as the great test by which their ministry is to be judged.

May it not be well for the young minister to inquire whether this lesson may not have its application to our own times? We may well inquire to what extent the test which Paul presents is the test of to-day. Does the Church regard fidelity as the supreme quality in a pastor? Perhaps it is safe to say that, other things being equal, there are few Churches that will not agree with Paul's view. Certainly no one would even remotely hint that unfaithfulness is not a most undesirable characteristic; but some might be found who would not make faithfulness the highest quality. They would disparage it by allowing substitutes for it. If one is remarkably eloquent and draws large congregations he is regarded with leniency, though he may be neglectful of some of the most important functions of the minister. If he is cultured and scholarly many will say, "We must overlook his failures to visit the needy, because he requires time to study." Paul was a scholar, and Apollos was an orator; and yet

neither scholarship nor eloquence was the supreme test. The one question to which he seeks an answer is whether they are found faithful. It is not a protest against learning or eloquence. Learning is important in order to study and understand the mysteries of God, eloquence is valuable in order to explain and apply them; but most of all fidelity is necessary, in order that everything may be truly said and every act may be faithfully performed.

There is danger lest this characteristic be overlooked by ourselves and by others. It is less dazzling than many other possessions. The faithful minister must do much of his work apart from the gaze and without the approval and support of others. The work of the more eloquent, though perhaps less faithful, pastor is greeted with applause; while that of the faithful one is often unnoticed, and the world says, and says truly, "He has only done his duty." And so he has; and if he is truly faithful he will work cheerfully until life shall close, without, it may be, a sign of recognition or praise. He seeks the approval of God, and with that he is content.

Fidelity is not only unrecognized and unrewarded often, but it is frequently unpopular. It will demand of the preacher that he shall speak the truth, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear. He will thus be compelled to pay the price of fidelity, namely, the disapproval of those whom the truth antagonizes. This, however, is one of the tests of his fidelity and one which he willingly endures.

There is further danger that the quality will not be properly appreciated, arising out of the fact that too many regard it as a vulgar and commonplace virtue and one that can be practiced without special training or unusual gifts. Grant that it is within the reach of everybody; it is thereby ennobled, not degraded. The rays of the sun and the gentle showers fall on everybody alike, but they are none the less necessary on that account. But it is not strictly correct to say that every person can be faithful. On the contrary, fidelity is a quality that inheres only in the highest order of men and women. It is only attainable by those who have great resources in themselves and rich assurance of the divine favor. In a sense, it may be said that only those who have a genius for truth and goodness are entirely faithful; but it is a genius acquired by effort, as well as received by heavenly communications.

This is not written to depreciate such other ministerial requisites as are either natural or are acquired by study, but to emphasize the fact that, as all other gifts, attainments, and graces are worthless without love, so in the ministry all other powers are destitute of real power for Christ without fidelity. This is the one element which Paul selects as distinguishing the early teachers of the Church, and it is equally desirable in the ministry of the present time.

EXEGETICAL—MATT. XIII, 13-16.

ONE of the most difficult problems for the student of the Bible is the precise meaning of many Old Testament passages when employed as

quotations by New Testament writers. Much as has been written on the subject, it is evident that much still remains to be done. An illustration of this will appear from a study of Matt. xiii, 13-15: "Therefore speak I to them in parables; because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. And unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall in no wise perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I should heal them."* This passage has proved an embarrassment to many good people. They have supposed it to mean that our Lord addressed the people in parables in order to prevent their reception of the truth and, consequently, their turning again and receiving healing at his hands. Such a meaning seems out of harmony with our conceptions of the earnest desire of the Saviour to bless mankind and with his constant efforts to remove their intellectual and spiritual blindness. It can only be justified to our thinking by the assumption that such hardening is the result of second causes, and not the direct act of God.

The interpretation put by many upon this passage, however, does not grow out of any necessary construction of the language employed. That Christ's object is to make the people know the mysteries of the kingdom, rather than to condemn them, is evident from the eleventh verse. He had just given them the parable of the sower. It seems a mode of instruction which he had not hitherto employed and was consequently new to them. "And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? And he answered and said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." He thus explains by saying that he could employ didactic methods with his disciples because they were familiar with the subject, while the others, who were ignorant of these mysteries and whose minds were blinded, required the employment of parables.

The passage is quoted, with slight variation, from Isa. vi, 9, 10: "And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn again, and be healed." Without stopping to interpret this passage we pass to the consideration of its employment in the New Testament. In the fourteenth verse of the thirteenth chapter of Matthew the passage is introduced with these words: "And unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith," etc. Their condition is such that they do not understand. Their "heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed." The last clause shows that the closing of the eyes was their own act. The use of this passage by Matthew is to show that they have reached the deplorable position portrayed

* Revised Version.

so vividly by Isaiah; and, hence, they need the teaching by parables in order to enlighten their minds and to remove their dullness. Christ had said of them, in explanation of the parable of the sower: "Therefore speak I to them in parables; because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand." It seems clear from the statement of the Saviour himself that their spiritual condition was so dark that they needed special illustration of the truth; and, hence, his employment of parables.

Trollope, in his comment on verse 11, takes this view: "It cannot be meant that our Lord spoke in parables that the Jews might not understand him; but that their perverseness rendered them incapable of appreciating his divine instructions." Similarly Bloomfield remarks on verse 13, "We are by no means to understand from this and verse 15 . . . that our Lord spake in parables in order to cause the blindness and obstinacy, and, therefore, occasion the final condemnation of the Jews." This passage is one of the quotations from the Old Testament in the New where the sacred writer employs the language of former times, not because it is applicable in all its details to the point in hand, but because its central idea expresses that which he wishes to convey.

METHODS OF MINISTERIAL SUCCESS.

For the purposes of this paper the work of the Church at home and of her missionaries abroad may be considered as one. The minister at home may get many lessons from the lives of those who have, in the order of Providence, founded and built up the modern missionary enterprise. Bishop John Coleridge Patteson, the apostle of New Zealand and a martyr for the Gospel, ranks among the foremost missionaries since the days of Paul. He was born near London, April 1, 1827, and carefully educated at Eton and Oxford, winning prizes and giving premonitions in many ways of a promising future in whatever calling he might select. He was profoundly stirred about the time of his graduation by a sermon of Bishop Selwyn. In 1853, joining in the welcome to this same bishop, on his return to England from his missionary labors in New Zealand, he was again deeply moved by his appeals, and going to his own room he sought relief in tears. Twelve years before the bishop had said to his mother, "Will you give me Coley?" His mother was now dead, and the bishop made the same request of his father, an earnest Christian and churchman. His father consented, and young Patteson accompanied Bishop Selwyn to New Zealand. We do not refer to this zealous missionary, who afterward was made a bishop, for the purpose of rehearsing his biography, but to speak of the sublimity of his character and his profound interest in his work. He was a discoverer of the best methods of missionary success. It did not take him long to ascertain that he must raise up a native ministry if he would be successful. He therefore brought his colored boys to the school at Auckland, where he had them trained, and subsequently he became the leader of the educational work and a thorough scholar and

instructor, as well as a hard-working missionary. His keen perception suggested to him that the chief thing in missions was the school. To train the youth and to prepare a native ministry is now recognized as the first requisite in all mission work. In Germany this has been done with great success; so, too, in India, China, Japan. Indeed, in all our mission fields this method is now the settled policy of the Church. The new building which is now in process of erection in Rome is the expression of this same idea, so clearly recognized by Bishop Patteson.

His delicacy and tact were illustrated in his habit of instructing the natives of his congregation apart from his English friends; not in the way of caste, but that he might have better access to them and instruct them more successfully. His personal work, too, was marvelous. He did everything. He thought a missionary ought to know a great deal. He greatly deplored his want of medical knowledge. He said: "I am now in a position to know just what to learn when once more in England—spend one day with old Fry (mason), one with John Venn (carpenter), and two every week at the Exeter hospital, and not to look on and see others. This is the mischief—do it yourself. Make a chair, a table, a box, a tub, everything. Do enough of every part to be able to do the whole. Every missionary should be a carpenter, a mason, a butcher, and a good deal of a cook." His idea of missionary preparation seemed to be extremely practical. Lest, however, one might suppose that these practicalities of everyday life were the only requisite which he demanded, it should be noted that the man who could do all these things, who performed for the poor black children the most menial services, taking them to his home, washing and combing them with his own hands, was at the same time an accomplished linguistic scholar, a well-read theologian, and a profound student in general literature. His early scholarship, which was of the first order, was not diminished, but augmented, in his missionary labors among very degraded people. Here we see at once the possibility of most devoted practical labors in connection with the most refined taste and earnest devotion to profound study.

Another trait of this wonderful missionary was his aversion to speaking of his own labors and sacrifices. This arose from pure modesty. He was indifferent to the praise of men; the satisfaction of his own conscience and the approval of God were enough for him. In like manner, he concealed those privations for the Master which would have stirred the world to sympathy had they known them. A grand missionary he was. He was not permitted to die in peace, but by the hands of murderers. Europeans had come into the field which he was taking for the Lord, and by their avarice and oppression of the natives aroused resentment and hostility. As a result he was killed at Nackapu, and as the inscription on his tomb says, "In vengeance for wrongs suffered at the hands of Europeans." Max Müller refers to Bishop Patteson as a specimen of the men by whose spirit and method heathen religions will be overcome and the Gospel of Christ will soon triumph in the world. The missionary successes of today are a confirmation of the opinions of this eminent scholar.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

THE HITTITES.

SHOULD the reader take a concordance of the Old Testament and examine all the passages referring to the Hittites he would be convinced at once, if he had no theory to maintain, that he was reading history, and not the exploits of some legendary people, the mere creation of some Oriental story-teller. The references are so explicit and numerous as to preclude the idea of a myth or interpolation. The descendants of Heth are first brought to our notice in that most ancient of all ethnological tables, the tenth chapter of Genesis. When Abraham, with his large following of Shemites, entered Canaan the Hittites of Hebron, from whom he bought Machpelah, were even at that early date a highly civilized people, polished and affable, shrewd and diplomatic, and accustomed to the laws of business, for they transferred their land by formal contracts, and handled silver and other precious metals "current with the merchant." This earliest money transaction, incidentally mentioned, is of great value, as it discloses to our view the advanced condition of this people as early, at least, as the time of Abraham.

But to return to the record. We are next informed that, while Jacob entered into matrimonial alliances with his own immediate relatives, Esau, on the other hand, to the great grief of his father and mother, married two Hittite wives. The Hittites are repeatedly mentioned during the exodus and the invasion of Canaan under Joshua, who, after the death of Moses, was commanded to take possession of all the territory "from the wilderness and this Lebanon even unto the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea toward the going down of the sun." Such is the similarity between the above passage, from the Book of Joshua, and the following, from a document of Tiglath-pileser, that we cannot refrain from reproducing the Assyrian inscription, which reads: "From the border of the distant mountains to the fords of the Euphrates, the land of the Hittites, and the upper sea of the setting sun." Now, the phrase "all the land of the Hittites" shows very conclusively that the sacred writer regarded them as very important and superior to the other nations or tribes named.

Joshua, faithful to his commission, subjected all the Canaanitish people. In the great battle near Lake Merom, where the children of Israel overthrew the united forces of the allied kings, including the Hittites, there were, we are incidentally told, both chariots and horses. Objections have been made to the genuineness of this passage, since, it is claimed, the semibarbarous tribes of Canaan could not have been acquainted with so advanced a mode of warfare at so early an age. Now, however, we know from the Egyptian monuments that the Hittites were famous for the use of war chariots. The epic of Pentaur describes at length the victory of

Rameses II, who lived before the exodus, over the Kheta, that is, the Hittites. The poet makes Rameses to say: "I had found twenty-five hundred chariots; I was in the midst of them; but they were dashed in pieces before my horses."

We again meet the Hittites in the time of the judges, when they appear to have regained their independence; for now we find them, not simply dwelling side by side with the Israelites, but even intermarrying with them. There is but little said of the Hittites during the monarchy. David had, however, at least two Hittite officers, Abimelech and Uriah. When Solomon ascended the throne the subjugation of these ancient enemies of Israel was complete. Bathsheba, the mother of the wise king, was probably a Hittite. Be that as it may, we know that Solomon, like Esau, married Hittite wives. Thus, all through the ages, from the time of Abraham to that of Ezra, we meet the Hittites; for even after the return of the Jews from captivity in Babylon we read that, to the sorrow of Ezra, the Hittites exerted a baneful influence over the Israelites.

Numerous and explicit as the above references are, they nevertheless but vaguely hint at the real greatness and power of the Hittites, who for many centuries successfully defied and triumphed over the armies of Egypt and Assyria. It is, therefore, manifest that the Hittites mentioned in the early books of the Old Testament were only a small part of a much larger nation, or a confederacy of nations, whose principal capital or capitals must have been outside of Palestine. We have, however, two, if not three, distinct references in the Bible to the Kheta of the Egyptian, or the Khattâ of the Assyrian, monuments. Solomon, it is said, had commercial intercourse with "all the kings of the Hittites." As these kings are named in immediate connection with the rulers of Egypt and Syria, it is evident that they were not the very same people as the Hittites mentioned in 1 Kings ix, 20, who were made tributary to the crown of Israel. We also read that, in the days of Jehoram, the son of Ahab, when Samaria was besieged by the Syrians, the army of Benhadad was thrown into a panic by a supernatural noise, which they regarded as the mighty noise of an advancing army. "Lo," they said, "the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites." The third reference is not quite so clear. We refer to 2 Sam. xxiv, 6. David is said to have ordered the enumeration of the people, and Joab went as far as the land of Tahtim-hodshi. This proper name has been a source of great trouble to the critics. It is now regarded as probably a corrupt reading for the Hittites of Kadesh.

The last three notices, though not as full and explicit as could be desired, yet read like genuine history and show clearly that the Hittites, mentioned, as they are, alongside of the kings of Egypt and Syria, were a people of commanding influence. It is, therefore, strange that, in the face of such evidence as we have and such circumstantial statements in so many places in the Old Testament where there could have been no motives for interpolations or the introduction of myths, there are learned men, like Francis William Newman, who boldly stamp the account of the

panic in the Syrian camp at Samaria as an extraordinary creation of the imagination. The story as told in the Bible, according to Newman, "does not exhibit the writer's acquaintance with the times in a very favorable light. Its unhistorical tone is too manifest to allow of our easy belief in it." And, as if these statements were not strong enough, the appends the following note: "No Hittite kings can have compared in power with the king of Judah, the real and near ally, who is not mentioned at all. . . . Nor is there a single mark of acquaintance with the contemporaneous history." Scholars like De Goeze and Merx insist that several references to the Hittites in the Old Testament are either interpolations or unhistorical.

Professor Cheyne is very loath to accept the biblical account of the Hittites, and, were it not for the more sure word of the Egyptian monuments and Assyrian tablets, he, like Newman, would make a short work of this troublesome people. Says the learned professor, in an article on the subject, "Some confusion has been caused in the treatment of the history of the Hittites by the uncritical use of the Old Testament." Cheyne, though forced to admit that the Hittites are repeatedly mentioned in the Bible, yet insists that the lists in which they and other pre-Israelitish populations are given cannot be strictly historical documents. To throw greater doubt upon the biblical records he assumes that they were all written centuries after the events described had taken place and, therefore, less worthy of credence than the monuments of Egypt and Assyria. As a specimen of his reasoning take the following: When Abraham needed aid in war he appealed to the Amorites; but when he wanted a grave in which to bury his beloved Sarah he turned to the more peaceful Hittites. The Hittites, he insists, were not peaceful, for the monuments make them very warlike; therefore the biblical account must be unhistorical. It will, however, puzzle the ordinary reader to understand how the sale of a piece of ground for a burying place should disprove the warlike nature of the Hittites. Abraham's turning to the Amorites, and not to the Hittites, for assistance in war may be explained on other grounds. We are next told that a branch of the Kheta (Hittites) may once have existed in Palestine; but in the same breath, as if afraid that he had made some uncritical statement, the professor adds, "Unfortunately there is no historical evidence that it did so." It is passing strange that Christian men in Christian schools should place more reliance upon the cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria or the hieroglyphs of Egypt than they do upon the events recorded in the earlier books of the Old Testament.

The Hittites, though not referred to in the writings of the Greek and Roman historians, played a most important rôle among the great nations of antiquity. Though their chief power and territory were in countries north of Palestine, especially between Kadesh, one of their capitals, on the Orontes, and Carchemish, another capital, on the Euphrates, we know from the inscriptions that they, like the English in modern times, had led their victorious armies in all directions and left behind them garrisons, and afterward planted colonies, not only along the Mediterranean coast

from the mouth of the Orontes to that of the Nile, and then farther inland, but also along the two main lines of travel between northern Syria and the Ægean Sea. These are not groundless assertions, but well-attested historical facts—facts which, if known twenty-five years ago, would have prevented many a hostile attack upon the veracity of our Holy Scriptures. No archæologist of our times will deny that the once powerful Hittites existed, though some radical critics still maintain that the Kheta, Khita, or Khattâ of the monuments must not be identified with the Khittim of the Hebrews. Since 1872 Hittite monuments have been discovered, not only at Hamah, Aleppo, and Carchemish, but also in Cappadocia, Lycaonia, Phrygia, and even on the very shores of the Ægean, as at Karabel, not far from Smyrna and Ephesus.

There is a romance about the discovery of the first Hittite inscription. As long ago as 1812 Burckhardt, the great Oriental traveler, informed the world that there was a stone in the wall of a certain house in Hamah on which were carved figures and signs, that no one could decipher, differing from any inscriptions he had ever seen. What they were he could not tell, but certainly not Egyptian hieroglyphs. But little attention was paid to this important discovery, and more than half a century had passed, when two Americans, Dr. Jessup and Mr. Johnson, found the stone described by Burckhardt. Such, however, was the veneration in which the stone was held by the Mohammedans that they failed to get even a cast of it or anything more than a very imperfect copy, the work of a native painter. In November, 1872, Sir Kirby Green, the British Consul at Damascus, and Dr. William Wright were invited by the governor of Syria, a very liberal man, the "creator of the Constantinople Museum," to accompany him to Hamah in order to study and obtain perfect casts or squeezes of the Hamah stones. Notwithstanding the power of the governor and the strength of his guard, the Hamathites bitterly opposed any interference with these venerated stones. Finally, however, at great expense and still greater labor, two gypsum casts were made of each of the three stones, and the originals were sent to Constantinople.

This was the beginning of a new era; for, on comparison of the inscriptions discovered in various places in Syria, Armenia, and Asia Minor, as well as on seals found at Nineveh, it was established that the inscriptions and the art in general were of the same nature as those upon the stones of Hamah. These Hittite monuments, without appealing to the records of Egypt or Assyria or to the Tel el-Amarna tablets, prove not only the vastness of the Hittite empire, but that this people had their own system of writing. This fact is of great importance as showing that the knowledge of writing was not the property of one or two nations of antiquity, but very common. Mr. Evans's recent discoveries in Crete, where he found traces of two systems of writing, corroborate this view.

Though we know, with certainty, neither the language nor the origin of the Hittites, the time has passed when any scholar will relegate this ancient and powerful people to the realm of the mythical. How gloriously God's word vindicated by the ancient monuments of lost empires!

MISSIONARY REVIEW.**RELIGION AND POVERTY IN CHINA.**

THERE met in the province of Shan-tung, China, November, 1893, a council of missionaries of several denominations and societies—Americans, Englishmen, and Canadians, Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists—and of the undenominational China Inland Mission. The forty-one delegates present represented nine missionary enterprises in Shan-tung and one in Ho-nan. The Conference grew out of the recommendation of the Committee on Union appointed at the Shanghai General Conference, in 1890, urging missionaries to unite in local Conferences to secure a better comprehension of the various methods of work and for mutual encouragement. The topics considered were of the usual type, with some marked exceptions. One of these was the poverty of the people and its causes. This subject might be of comparatively little interest were it limited to the single province of Shan-tung; but the missionaries distinctly say that, with the exception of the “burden” of the Yellow River, with its frequent floods and shifting channels which do not affect more than three per cent of the population, the conditions and causes which they set forth obtain generally in the other provinces of China, and very largely over the entire empire.

That bad roads or the lack of roads limits the exchange of commodities and that customs barriers at short distances aggravate trade obstructions need no accentuation. But it is the moral conditions obstructing the development of commerce and manufactures which are of special importance in the estimation of these men. They specify a general fear of trickery, swindling, insincerity, lying, and injustice as repressing commerce and, especially, investments and cooperative schemes. There is uncertainty in the filling of orders. Adulteration is practiced to a degree that vitiates industries as well as commerce. The tea trade, they say, is being destroyed through this latter vice. Then comes taxation under conditions which admit of “squeezing,” amounting in known and specified instances and classes to sixty-seven per cent of the valuation; also, injustice in administration of laws and a total failure to recognize that public weal and private advantage are bound up together. There is, in fact, a reversal of all the moral axioms which underlie the dealings of Western nations. All this has served to kill public spirit, to destroy mutual confidence, and to render public plans for improved methods of commerce and manufacture impossible.

Underlying the moral causes of the lack of prosperity, these gentlemen make bold to declare, is a profounder cause—the religious beliefs of the people. Rev. A. G. Jones, an English Baptist missionary, said, “They lack the power of the hope of an everlasting life.” “It is passing strange,” he added, “that heavenly hope should make a richer people, but it is so.

Nothing stimulates more than a future. Their world has none but what is a dreary repetition of the past, its changes and its precedents." The doctrine of fate takes away from them, as it does from any people, the sense of responsibility. The vagueness and contradictions of their beliefs leave them destitute of moral courage. Right and truth have to give way to conventionalities and proprieties. Ancestral worship produces a desire for a numerous progeny, which leads to early marriages; and of these overpopulation and weakly population are the result. The custom, too, of having costly weddings sinks families hopelessly in debt. One might discredit this picture but that it is confirmed by those familiar with every part of China. The Rev. Mr. Cady draws just such a graphic picture of the distrust and dishonesty which reign in the far west of China. That there are exceptions and exceptional features may be readily conceded. Where the Chinese come in contact with foreigners on the coast they are shrewd enough to learn the basis of the foreigners' dealings; and we hear of most honorable conduct of Chinese firms which would command a premium in any center of Christian trade. But the trend in the nation at large, as these gentlemen point out, is to destroy the conditions of thrift and wealth.

There is little doubt but that this dishonesty, honeycombing public departments, has led to the present humiliation of the great "boneless giant" by the "nation of monkeys," as the Chinese designate the Japanese. Evidence is not far to seek that China's naval ships have been manned by dummies, coolies borrowed for the inspector's count, while he and the local commander divided as spoils the salaries of the nonexistent naval defenders of the country. Little wonder that China should be found unprepared for war when her navy has only masked forces on its vessels! A current story runs to the effect that when Viceroy Li Hung Chang inspected the "Northern Squadron," just before the breaking out of the war, the officials responsible in the premises hurriedly employed a gang of brickmakers to mold clay cannon balls to pass examination as ammunition. This story may not be true, but it corresponds with hundreds of others of similar import. The same lack of moral qualities has led to the decadence of her arsenals, as at Chi-nan-fu. There is no wealth possible to a people without conscience; and nothing can give China a conscience but the Gospel.

OUR JAPANESE POPULATION.

WHILE there have been some prejudice and antagonism to the Japanese immigration on our Pacific coast, it has been but trifling compared with that with which the Chinese have met. There are several patent reasons for this. The Japanese, for one thing, are not likely to come in such vast numbers as would the Chinese were the immigration of the latter unrestricted. They are more cleanly in their personal habits. They seek assimilation with occidental forms of civilization. They do not come in such competition with the labor classes, being for the most part students, artisans, sailors, and sometimes laborers. The increase in the proportion

of merchants, of late, is observable. Japanese shops and shopkeepers are found in nearly all Pacific coast cities, from San Diego to Victoria. This class will, at least for a long while, meet with less opposition than the cooly class. They are young men from fifteen to thirty years of age, less than three hundred women being among the seven thousand Japanese now in this country. Eight years ago the Japanese population in the United States numbered one thousand.

The Japanese over the sea are in their first fervor of enthusiasm, the enjoyment of which they do not propose losing because the Western world has passed beyond the age of jubilant experience and expression. This makes them, to the older nations of Europe in particular, seem impulsive and possibly unstable. But it makes them especially susceptible to a type of piety for examples of which, unfortunately for us, we are gradually being compelled to turn to the past. This fervor finds illustration in the Methodist revivals which, for five years, have swept over the Japanese population of the Pacific coast and brought one seventh of the whole to the altar as communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This is not a sporadic movement, for it has gone steadily forward for more than half the duration of Japanese immigration. It has exhibited practical fruits, in most signal cases, of self-denial and self-sacrificing zeal, causing men to give up lucrative positions for meager and precarious support, that they might follow their brothers into mining camps, ranches, and deserts, far away to Alaska, over the seas to Hawaii, or back to the home-land in order to seek some kinsman to whom they felt impelled to tell the strange experience that had come to themselves, in the possession of the new ideals, the new joy, and the new love.

MISSION WORK IN AFRICA.

MISSIONARY WALKER, of Uganda, Central Africa, informs us that the people are exceedingly desirous to obtain good reading, but books are expensive. The worth of a manload of books in Uganda is fifty dollars, and a copy of the New Testament is worth one dollar and twenty-five cents, that is, a woman's wages for two months. Christians are known at sight by a bag they carry over the left shoulder, in which they transport their books from place to place. It is not uncommon for people to travel a three-days' journey to have something explained which they do not understand. One woman, who was too poor to buy a book for herself, borrowed a copy of the gospels and committed them to memory. The native Christians themselves established the rule that no polygamist should be admitted to baptism or to the Lord's Supper. The husband must give up all his wives but one. Since there is no surplus of females it is not difficult for these divorced wives to be married again. Walker says that the time has not arrived when European women should be sent to Uganda; but he says they may be sent to the east coast of Africa in order to become acquainted with African life and be ready to go to Uganda when the proper time arrives. Bishop Tucker writes from the capital that

on Christmas, 1892, he preached to five thousand people, including the king and all the chief captains; also that Bishop Hannington's remains were to be interred in the church on the 31st of December. He says: "The fourteen loads of books which I brought are to be sold to-morrow, and they will disappear like snow before the sun. There are eight thousand copies of the Holy Scriptures in the language of the country. The people are beside themselves with delight. Uganda seems to me to be the hope of Africa. To leave it to itself would be more than a mistake; it would be a crime."

THE LANGUAGE FACTOR IN MISSION TERRITORY.

It has been the policy of Great Britain to offer no restrictions to the introduction into her colonies of any language whatsoever. She restrains no Italian, Frenchman, Spaniard, German, Chinaman, or Hottentot from the free use of his native language. But the policy of France is the reverse of this. Recognizing the radical difference of French civilization from that which would be introduced through the medium of the English language, France has adopted, under the lead of the Jesuits in part at least, a language policy for her colonies in Africa which excludes all English-speaking missionaries. The *Sierra Leone Messenger* points out that this policy has imposed a new difficulty on the missionary work of Protestants in large parts of Africa. The Presbyterian Church was obliged to arrange with an evangelical missionary society of Paris to conduct the good work it had developed in the Gabun or else see it all go to pieces; and now the Rio Pongas mission of West Indian Africans to their brothers in Africa has been compelled to start new mission centers on the other side of the river, that they may retain their hold on that portion of their work lying within French delimitations. The policy of the French to exclude all schools from their African colonies unless they be conducted in the French language and on French lines practically debar Protestant missions from the vast sections of interior Africa falling within the French sphere. The latest instance of the enforcement of this policy of the French occurred at Benito, on the west coast, where the Presbyterian Church had one of its most flourishing stations. The French visited the place and insisted that the French language be used exclusively, not even permitting the use of the vernacular language. As it was impossible to comply with this order the school was closed. This hindrance was temporarily removed by the arrival, soon after, of a Spanish man of war, the commander of which declared that Benito belonged neither to France nor to Spain. He presented a Spanish flag to a native, directing him to raise it and to let the French take it down if they saw fit. On the east coast the missionaries have boldly pushed into the interior, with the result that England and Protestantism are entrenched therein; but on the west coast the Protestant missionaries have clung to the coast, and have thereby prospectively lost the whole "Hinterland" to Protestantism.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

Paul Chapuis. Comparatively few are the leaders of theological thought among the French-speaking peoples, and such as can be classed as leaders among the French would scarcely deserve that honor among the Germans. Chapuis has received most of his leading ideas from German sources. Nevertheless, his eminence in French theology entitles him to mention here. For more than a decade the doctrine of the preexistence of Christ has been a bone of contention among French theologians. In fact, it is but recently that anyone in the modern Christian Church has ventured to deny it. But among theologians of the present day it is not an uncommon thing to dispute the correctness of the utterances of Paul and John on that subject and to explain them away as being not inspired, but drawn from ideas then current, but which did not correspond to reality. At the recent dedication of the new university buildings at Lausanne Chapuis delivered an address, on the change which is going on in modern theology in the department of Christology, before an immense audience of Swiss and other theologians, which was subsequently given to the general public in the *Revue de Lausanne* and afterward in book form under the title *La Transformation du Dogme Christologique au Sein de la Théologie moderne*. The deniers of the preexistence of necessity deny the doctrine of the kenosis, and this is one of the main features of the view of Chapuis. According to him, the earlier Christologies, even those of Paul and John, were influenced by old Greek ideas drawn from physical and metaphysical science. This must give way to a Christology founded upon the Gospel and whose distinctive characteristics shall be ethical-religious, as opposed to metaphysical. There can be no doubt that theology has insisted so strongly upon the metaphysical unity of Christ with the Father as to have obscured the ethical-religious unity, and that thereby it has been more faithful to Greek than to evangelical thought. But it is altogether another thing which is aimed at by Chapuis than to shift the center of gravity of Christological opinion. He and his coadjutors refuse to be content with the emphasis of the ethical-religious unity of Christ with the Father. They are determined to know nothing among us of any metaphysical unity whatever; and, hence, the denial of the truths of the doctrine of the kenosis and of the preexistence, which in some measure stand or fall together and which imply the hated metaphysical unity. If all parties would cease quarreling over the substance of the Father and the Son and preach Christ's character and saving merits the world would be the better for it.

Dr. Heinrich K. H. Delf. Appearing for the seventeenth time as an author, in a book of philosophy, he proposes to sum up his views on all

philosophical subjects. He holds that we cannot through the intellect know God as a living reality, but only in the heart, by means of religion. Nor do we have an immediate consciousness of God; but rather the search after God is the innermost nature of the heart, which cannot tolerate the pessimism arising from the ordinary philosophical and scientific study of nature. It is the result of a remnant of naturalism which leads Christian theologians, even in the present day, to see in nature a revelation of God. Rather is God revealed in our consciousness. But God must also be revealed in a human personality. Hence, in Jesus Christ God is revealed to us as the living power of the ideal. Forth from these postulates of religion all philosophy must proceed. Philosophy need not seek to discover God, but only to explain him. He then proceeds to establish the view that the heart is a true organ of knowledge, and then explains how God, who was the first will, came to personality. Having attained possession of his freedom and inner riches, he began to pour forth the stream of his love toward an object, which object was found in the eternal Son, who is also the eternal ideal-man. Delft attempts a philosophy of the heart. He really shows that philosophy ought to start with the concept of God as found in Christianity; and if all philosophy would accept this view there would be less confusion than there is. The world can only be understood when the God of revelation is postulated. It is folly for philosophy to imagine itself able to find out God from the world and by human speculation. But when he proposes to search for the inner condition and means of the life of God, and on the ground of the results to explain given, individual, and historical existence in its real character, inner causes, genesis, and development, he sets, even for his philosophy, an impossible task. There is nothing in religion which makes such a process possible. With such a process religion has nothing to do. If men will speculate upon these incomprehensible themes let them not drag religion into the maze, either by determining dogma by philosophical requirements or by making Christianity responsible for any particular philosophical speculation. Christianity has to do with God and what he is to the heart. All else is useless and dangerous.

Professor Dr. J. P. Valetton, Jr. For several years past his duties as professor in the department of the Old Testament in the University of Utrecht have led him to the investigations whose publication has given him a leading position among Dutch theologians. Following the Graf-Wellhausen theory, he gives to Amos and Hosea a leading place among the prophets of Israel. He compares the two somewhat as follows: The significance of the two prophets in the development of religion lies in their knowledge of God. The fundamental article in the Israelitish faith was, "Israel the people of Jehovah, and Jehovah the God of Israel." But what the people took for a self-evident and natural condition these prophets discerned as an expression of the divine love. And, while the people looked upon their relation to God as a source of blessing and a

reason for liturgical service, as well as a ground for the expectation of future prosperity, the prophets laid all the emphasis upon the ethical-spiritual obligations arising from this relation. Nevertheless, the two differed. For Amos Jehovah is the God of nature and history; by Hosea the first place was given to the thought of God's pity. Amos wanted to substitute for the prevalent sensuous liturgical service the ethical service of Jehovah; Hosea, spiritual reverence in love and royalty. Amos was one whom we to-day would call a moralist, that is, he placed the ethical element of religion in the foreground. Hosea, on the other hand, was a mystic, that is, one for whom in the last analysis the personal relation and communion of the soul with God was everything. According to Amos, true religion consisted in doing good and avoiding evil—to be religious meant to be good. According to Hosea, all would be well in personal, social, and civil life if the personal relation of the individual with God was right. Amos can be compared with James, Hosea with John. With Amos, as with James, the question was what one does; with Hosea, as with John, what one is. The former demanded righteousness, the latter love. Nevertheless, these two distinct views of religion do not conflict with each other, but mutually supplement each other. Further, neither of the prophets regards the individual Israelite as the subject of religion. With Hosea, Israel is personified, and Israel, not the individual, is to be pious. With Amos, the nation consisted of an aggregation of individuals. But each is regarded as a part of the whole. Valeton thinks that, side by side with Isaiah, prophets like Amos and Hosea have an eternal significance, and that our knowledge of God rests upon them.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Encyclopädie und Methodologie der Theologie (Encyclopedia and Methodology of Theology). By Professor Dr. Heinrich Kihn. Of necessity there is but little activity in theological production among Roman Catholics. It has been twenty years since a work on encyclopedia and methodology from the Romanist standpoint appeared in Germany, and it met with but little favor. Professor Kihn here breaks the long silence. He divides theology into formal and material. Under the formal he includes the determination of the nature of theology, a review of its history, and a statement of the fundamental principles of theological study, together with a discussion of the languages of the Bible, and hermeneutics and its application to biblical exegesis. But, while it might appear from this classification that the book would allow some freedom in criticism and in exegesis, such is not in reality the case. For the freedom of the exegete is always to be limited by the authority of the Church. The book adopts the theology of Thomas Aquinas as ideal and, in fact, regards the Middle Ages in the same light. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic Church in the time when it was most influenced by rationalism and Protestantism was in a state of deep degeneration. The author

thinks, however, that Romanism, in going back to the fathers, in a better appreciation of the scholastic theology, and in its union with the post-Tridentine scholasticism, especially the Jesuitical science, has struck its roots afresh into fruitful soil. It is interesting to notice the departments of theology which Romanists include and which Protestants ignore; for example, casuistry, which is regarded as of immense value, mysticism, which is defined as the doctrine of the unification of the soul with God by means of an extraordinary gift of contemplation, and asceticism, or the scientific doctrine of the principles, manifestations, hindrances, helps, and exercises of Christian virtue. More than is usual in Romanist work, the Protestant Church receives fair treatment. But for the fact that he dare not, Kihn would be true to his scholarly instincts and treat theology broadly and fearlessly. Although of minor utility, we believe that the study of casuistry in the light of Protestant evangelical principles would prove a blessing to the individual Christian; and there is much in mysticism and asceticism which we might and ought to utilize. The Protestant can learn much from Romanism which will benefit him in his private life and make him more useful to the world.

L'Église et l'État, ou les deux Puissances au XVIII^e Siècle (Church and State, or, The Two Powers in the Eighteenth Century). By P. de Crousaz-Crétet. Though written from the ultramontane standpoint, it is tolerably fair and excellently well written. Very vividly is depicted the incapacity of the clergy in their efforts against Rome, and the weak endeavors of the State to secure secular oversight of religious foundations and the right to reform the monasteries. The life of the Church was behind that of the preceding century. The fall of Jesuitism became a fixed certainty. A transformation was impossible. Clement XIII declared that the order should be as it was or it should not be at all. But in all these things the interests of Rome were advanced in the end. The author speaks of the Jansenists as a sect, regards the Jesuits as persecuted without cause, and the ideal condition that in which the laws of the Church are equally the laws of the State. Accordingly, he believes that the Church ought to be independent in spiritual matters, and the State in secular. Rightly defined, no Protestant could object to this. But as interpreted by Romanists it unfortunately gives the Church a power which the State alone can possess where religious liberty is guaranteed to all. The author confesses that the old *régime* can never be restored. But he finds a way out which shall not injure Rome. He censures the Gallican parliament because they would lord it over the consciences of men. The bishops, on the other hand, stood for freedom and conscience. But it is forgotten or ignored by him that they only claimed freedom from the secular power. To Rome every conscience was to be subject. Very well does the author understand that a compulsory faith is of but little account and that the French State will never again provide for it. Its wickedness and unchristian character he does not mention. Like all other well-instructed Romanists, he makes the best of an unfavorable situation. Rome knows

when it is beaten in any conflict, although it never gives up its purposes; and when it fails in one direction it tries another. In this country we may learn from history and save ourselves from papal machinations. To hear Romanists talk here, we would almost suppose that they were more American than Protestants themselves.

Die Willensfreiheit und ihre Gegner (The Freedom of the Will and its Deniers). By Dr. Constantin Gutberlet. To Arminians such a book seems almost unnecessary. Yet it must not be forgotten that much of the most recent philosophy denies, either in theory or in fact, the freedom of the will. Witness Schopenhauer's pessimism, Wundt's physiological psychology, Paulsen's almost atheistical ethics, and the Danish Höfding. Here we find answered objections to the freedom of the will arising from ethical statistics, anthropological considerations, physiological psychology, speculation, and the mechanical view of the universe. The principal proof of the freedom of the will he finds in the uniform and indestructible testimony of our own consciousness. Yet the book represents rather a middle position between extreme fatalism, on the one hand, and liberty, on the other. It recognizes that even in the spiritual world every act must have its sufficient ground; also that this is not found alone in the inner condition of the actor prior to the action, but, in part, in the external excitation to action and, in part, in the free operation of volition, which cannot be coerced by the most powerful and clearly conceived motives to the contrary. The book freely admits that we can only affect the will by means of representations, and that it is not a single representation, but often a combination of representations, which determines our motive; and, furthermore, that it is not dependent alone upon our choice what representations or combinations of them shall be present in our consciousness at any given juncture. It is also admitted that in almost all human decisions the outcome depends upon inherited character and upon education and external conditions, over all of which we have but little control. By the time all these facts are admitted there seems to be but little room left for the exercise of free will. Yet so strong is the consciousness of freedom that it must be accepted as a fact. Rightly viewed, it would appear that there is a sufficient freedom to make any person responsible for his own acts, yet enough restriction of our freedom by the facts above mentioned to mitigate the guilt of many an otherwise blameworthy act. The work is marred by several defects, a principal one being that, as a Roman Catholic, the author accepts the philosophy which underlies Romanist ethics. But on the whole it is a work which all will do well to read.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL

How German Liberal Churchmen Regard the Bible. The very term "liberal" denotes that no fixed views of anything are held by the "liberals." Each one is at liberty to believe as he pleases. Yet there are

some prominent points of agreement between them, and it is not at all impossible to formulate at least their average belief concerning the Bible, which is about as follows : The old doctrine of inspiration is entirely discarded. The Bible is not an absolutely divine book, but one in the production of which men were active, at least to such a degree that man's work is perceptible. It is, therefore, to be subjected to criticism the same as any other human product. The Bible is, nevertheless, the best source from which to obtain a knowledge of original Christianity. No other documents, whether earlier or later than those of the New Testament, whether long known or recently discovered, are at all equal to the New Testament in this particular. This would remain true, even though it should be proved that books whose genuineness has never hitherto been doubted are not the productions of those to whom they are attributed. The New Testament is, therefore, not an authority which can compel belief, but the source of knowledge concerning Christ and his religion; that is, an historical authority, not an absolute one. It follows from this that the liberal churchman is not interested in the study of the Bible merely as a matter of science. His attitude toward it is different from his attitude toward the *Vedas* or the *Koran*. Regarding himself as a Christian, he desires to know what the earliest and best records represented Christianity to be. One to whom Jesus Christ has become comfort and power, light and life, as the liberal claims that Christ is to him, must desire to learn out of the best and most trustworthy sources whatever they have to say concerning the Redeemer. Nevertheless, the liberal insists that, as it was the relation of the individual to Jesus Christ, producing the conviction that he was receiving a revelation from God, upon which the Church was established, so it is with the individual of to-day. The faith of the individual is made possible by the Bible, since it conveys to men and maintains among them the knowledge of Christ and his redemption. But this faith is not produced by the Scripture, but through the revelation of God in Christ, of which the Scripture is the witness. Men become believers, not because they have the Scripture, but because in the Scripture they find that which makes itself felt in the inner man as revelation from God, and which, as a result, produces faith. The Bible is thus a means of grace, since it makes known to man the grace of God in Christ. It is a means of grace in this sense, because the revelation of God to man is so reflected therein as to be accessible to the human understanding. Since the Old Testament is absolutely essential to the understanding of the New, it must be retained. The revelation of God in nature, conscience, and history cannot lift man above himself. It cannot put man into harmony with himself, nor free him from the power of sensuality or selfishness, nor guarantee peace to a soul burdened with a consciousness of sin and striving to secure real communion with God. Hence, the Bible is said to contain the word of God. And, while it has varying worth in its various parts, it is all needful. In proportion, however, as any part approaches the true teachings of Christ or recedes from them is it valuable. The care of the reader of the Bible must be directed toward a con-

stantly increasing clearness and power of knowledge concerning the revelation of God in the Bible, which is the foundation of all purest Christian knowledge, the authority for all genuine Christian piety, the source of all most helpful Christian edification, for all time the most precious treasure of the Church, and the object of most earnest investigation. For the individual Christian and theologian there is no more sacred duty than to secure for himself the blessings of the revelation which is given to man in Christ for redemption; and this is to be done by a constantly deeper penetration into the Holy Scripture, both by scientific investigation and practical, religious employment of the same. Better than the piling up of Scripture citations and scriptural forms of speech is the real understanding of a single historically important and religiously significant passage. And more important than the most correct memorization of the catechism is the internal application of biblical ideas, on the basis of a sound comprehension and with a view to their rational use. From this review of the liberal position it is evident that in the last analysis it is essentially that of the orthodox party. The liberal does not accept the New Testament because of any authority it claims or because of any authority which is claimed for it, but because it appeals to him with all the force of a record of a revelation of God in Christ. He is convinced, not coerced. If we are not mistaken this is the case with most intelligent evangelical Christians to-day, though they may know it not. What the Bible teaches to such is, as with the liberal, a question of interpretation.

Children's Mission Bands in Switzerland. Five years ago the Swiss Conference had scarcely made a beginning in this important service for the children. The number of bands has now grown to 18, with 316 members. Their diligence is manifest in the fact that, out of 3,957 francs raised within the Swiss Conference for missions, 2,463 francs were from these mission bands; that is, 316 children raised almost \$500 in a year. Their methods are essentially the same as those which prevail in this country. The band is presided over by a suitable adult. The children knit, sew, and crochet, and missionary intelligence is imparted. It is said that the children are so zealous that they beg their leaders to continue the meeting beyond the hour appointed for the purpose.

Evangelical Christianity in Spain. According to reports issued by Pastor Fliedner, the evangelical Church in Spain has seventy congregations, with twelve thousand communicants and eight thousand children in the parish schools. Among the means employed for the spread of evangelical truth the translation of German hymns into Spanish has proved very effective. Three orphanages, two hospitals, and two publishing houses are, also, exceedingly helpful in spreading Protestantism in Spain, which, as scarcely any other country on the face of the earth, is under the yoke of the papacy.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

WHAT consequences will follow the Chino-Japanese war, for civilization, morals, religion? The whole world is concerned and watches in anxious spectatorship the strife of the swarthy soldiers upon the soil of Cathay. To prophesy the full results is something that so discriminating a judge as Sir Thomas Wade hesitates to undertake, notwithstanding his forty years' residence in China and his twelve years' official service as the resident minister of his government at Peking. Such temperate predictions, however, as he ventures to make form the basis of a most instructive article in the November *Contemporary*, under the title of "The Chino-Japanese Conflict, and After." In the science of warfare the Japanese "have allowed their armies to be trained and disciplined by European officers." Should they gain the conquest of China their victory may mean "a portentous explosion which may shake the whole world." Russia and France, Germany and England, all may aim for acquisition in the partition of the conquered territory; and America itself would not be indifferent, as of late "her interests in the Pacific have been steadily increasing." The fourth article of the periodical, on "The New Syriac Gospels," describes some of the characteristics of this lately discovered manuscript. Few are better fitted than Professor J. Rendel Harris, the author of the paper, to pass judgment upon this newly found text. Without professing to "exhaust the critical side of the question, nor to enter upon its more distinctly theological issues," he has aimed to prove "the existence of a bifurcation in the primitive text of the New Testament from the remarkable evidence which has recently come to light, and to show which of the two branches has the greater claim to be considered the primitive text." Of the territory known as "The Eastern Hindu-Kush" Colonel A. G. Durand writes: "For five years I have lived in it in peace and war; the fascination of its desolate grandeur is still upon me; the memories of solitary days spent in the heart of its glorious mountains can never fade, nor can the kindly feelings toward the cheery and manly inhabitants of its sequestered valleys." The two closing articles are by Frederic Harrison, on "The Amalgamation of London," and by C. Laurence Gomme, on "The Future Government of London." The first of the two papers describes the report of the royal commission on the amalgamation of the city and county of London as "masterly;" the second calls the recommendations of the commission "comprehensive and capable of meeting the problem to be solved." If the trend of the two articles be any index, amalgamation is already well on the way.

THE opening article in the *North American Review* for December is from the pen of Monsignor Satolli, and sets forth in elaborate description the excellences of "The Catholic School System in Rome." That the paper is

a prejudiced statement of facts is confirmed to us by a resident of the great Italian city whose facilities and fitness for observation make his testimony of value. This is at least the seventh issue of this monthly, out of the twelve numbers for 1894, which has discussed and commended some phase of Romanism. We would modestly submit that fair play calls for the kind notice of the creeds and benevolent work of the different branches of the Protestant Church—for instance, of Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, or the Baptist Church. Why not, if the *North American*, as an impartial chronicler of facts, wishes to lead its readers into all truth? The paper which follows, by the Hon. Wade Hampton, discusses "Brigandage on our Railroads." Assuming that the epidemic of train robbery is spreading over the whole country, it suggests the employment of such drastic measures for its extinction as inner doors of iron grating in express cars, repeating shotguns, and foxhounds to track the fleeing robbers. Under the title of "Two Great Authors" Senator Henry Cabot Lodge writes entertainingly of Holmes and Froude. Professor C. A. Briggs, in a succeeding article, reviews the work of "The Salvation Army," and judges that by its fruits it has vindicated "its great importance in the religious development of our century." The need of changed methods in governmental representation abroad is vigorously shown by Henry White, ex-secretary of the embassy at London, in "Consular Reforms." Dr. Louis Robinson follows with his second paper on "Wild Traits in Tame Animals;" Adjutant General Ruggles shows the necessity for "The Proposed Increase of the Army;" and Sergius Stepniak, in a paper on "How the Czar's Death Affects Europe," declares that "autocracy has outlived its age," inquires as to the personality of the new czar, and shows that Russia must follow a policy of peace. The concluding article is on "The Meaning of the Elections;" its writers are Representative Joseph W. Babcock and Senator Charles J. Faulkner, chairmen of the Republican and Democratic Congressional Committees. The difference in their interpretation of recent events is striking.

THE clearing away of some of the mists that have lately obscured the vision of the American Church seems the purpose of Dr. A. T. Pierson in his article on "The Parliament of Religions," in the December number of the *Missionary Review of the World*. According to his vigorous showing, the spectacular association of Christianity with the faiths of heathendom at Chicago was unwise. When, more than a year since, the Parliament of Religions "took its place in history" the writer "felt compelled to testify against the whole scheme, convinced that, at the very basis of it, there lay a blunder, and that, without impugning the motives of its originators and abettors, its final outcome must be evil rather than good." Fortifying his belief by the testimony of others, Dr. Pierson now affirms that the Parliament was a mistake: (1) In its "inadequate presentation and representation of Christianity;" (2) In the "false impressions left on hundreds" of attendants; (3) In the establishment of "a bad prece-

dent;" (4) In the exaltation of some individuals "into an undue, undeserved prominence," and in helping to "propagate false faiths;" (5) In the substitution of "laxity for liberality;" (6) In implying that "salvation is not in Christ alone." Among the other papers of this periodical are one on "Babism—Its Doctrines and Relation to Mission Work," by J. H. Shedd, D.D., one on "The Evangelization of the Jew," by J. E. Mathieson, and one on "The Ministry of Women," by A. J. Gordon, D.D. Nothing seems to be overlooked by this vigilant magazine.

THE *Methodist Review* of the Church South contains: 1. "The Historical Situation in the First Epistle of John," by Gross Alexander, S.T.D.; 2. "A Constitutional History of American Episcopal Methodism," by the Rev. G. B. Winton; 3. "The Virginia Woman of To-day," by Mrs. Mary Stuart Smith; 4. "The Art of Sacred Reading—A Study in Vocal Exegesis," by the Rev. J. T. Docking, Ph.D.; 5. "Physiological Psychology," by Professor A. C. Wightman, Ph.D.; 6. "Korea, Past and Present," by W. R. Lambuth, D.D.; 7. "Coeducation of the Sexes," by the late Dr. C. F. Deems; 8. "British South Africa," by E. R. Norton; 9. "Evolution as a Method of Creation," by M. B. Chapman, D.D.; 10. "Voltaire—A Character Study," by J. M. Wright, D.D.; 11. "A Theistic Argument Restated," by the editor. The writer of the first article maintains that the epistle of John "was written in view of the heresy of the gnostics, with its doctrinal, ethical, and practical abuses." The second article is complimentary of the recent volume of the editor of the review; the third, on Virginia women, is written by one of them, and is debonair and congratulatory. In the sixth article Korea is likened to Florida, hanging "pendent from the shore of a great continent." Sick and needing "treatment," she must be "led, rather than coerced, into a policy which shall foster a new life, the germs of which have already been so successfully transplanted by the missionaries of the cross." In the seventh paper Dr. Deems commends the scheme of coeducation. The ninth article is favorable to evolution as a method of creation, and believes that, whatever the outcome may be, "the Bible has nothing to fear." In the last article Dr. Tigert himself writes on "a single attribute of the Deity—his universal causal efficiency." The bimonthly, as a whole, is taking on increased breadth, vigor, and attractiveness under the new management.

AMONG the entertaining articles in the *Fortnightly Review* for November is the description of some quaint Oriental customs, by A. Henry Savage-Landor, in "Burning Questions of Japan." By his showing, this emulative people have not yet fully learned to imitate the Western nations without grotesque results. But, as the years go on, they will "adapt Western civilization to themselves, instead of adapting themselves to Western civilization." In the following article A. W. Rücker writes an attractive biographical notice of "Herman Von Helmholtz," and exalts to a high place this late German physicist. In "Women's Newspapers" Miss Evelyn March-Phillips indulges in good-natured ridicule of the attempts

of modern English papers to provide for the wants of women and calls for publications that shall minister to their higher needs. Of such an ideal newspaper she says: "It would not print so much about dress, but what it did include would be excellent of its kind and not merely put in to fill up space. The ultra-frivolous might avoid it, but it would appeal to many who never look at the ordinary fashion paper. Such a paper would aim at occupying a leading status in the world of women; it would be something more than a mere colorless catalogue of feminine doings and dresses." But, whatever the English press may be, have we not already such women's papers this side of the Atlantic? In an article on "The Possibility of Life in Other Worlds" Sir Robert Ball discusses a question which never loses its charm. The drift of modern research, he claims, "has been in favor of the supposition that there may be life on some of the other globes," though at present "we cannot conjecture what the organism must be which would be adapted for a residence in Venus or Mars."

THE *New World* for December has: 1. "Some Questions in Religion now Pressing," by D. N. Beach; 2. "A Unitarian's Gospel," by C. E. St. John; 3. "Athanasianism," by L. L. Paine; 4. "Science a Natural Ally of Religion," by E. B. Andrews; 5. "One Lord and His Name One," by S. R. Calthrop; 6. "The Gospel according to Peter," by J. A. Robinson; 7. "John Addington Symonds," by Frank Sewall; 8. "Modern Jesuitism," by C. G. Starbuck; 9. "The Mimicry of Heredity," by George Batchelor. The "four primary questions" discussed in the first article are: "Is God in the Church, and not equally, also, in the world?" "Is forgiveness the key word?" "What of Trinity?" and "What of immortality?" The fourth article, by the president of Brown University, declares that "to do aught against real science is to shut a prophet's mouth, to stifle a voice from on high." In his article on "John Addington Symonds" the author writes a captivating notice of the late *littérateur*. "With Browning and Ruskin," he says, "Symonds has formed a third in a triad of writers who have filled a unique place in English letters, that of interpreters to the Anglo-Saxon mind of the life, the art, and the literature of Italy." The closing article ably argues that "all our beliefs about heredity must be revised."

THE *American Catholic Quarterly* for October has eleven papers in its table of contents. Among them are "The Newest Darwinism," by St. George Mivart; "Testimony of the Greek Church to Roman Supremacy," by A. F. Hewit, D.D.; "Criticism of Recent Pantheistic Evolution," by Rev. J. J. Ming; "Introductory Remarks to the Pope's Encyclical," by Cardinal Gibbons; "To the Rulers and Nations of the World," by Pope Leo XIII; "The Supernatural and its Limitations," by A. F. Marshall. The encyclical of the pope, which makes up the seventh article, is a choice piece of reading. Its tenor is in the following extract: "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty."

THE *Gospel in All Lands* for December opens with an article on the "Country and People of Thibet." Some of the following papers are on "The Eskimos," by Bishop W. D. Reeve, of Mackenzie River, and "The Situation in Japan," by the Rev. Julius Soper. The reader also finds the able paper of Dr. A. S. Hunt on the "Origin and Growth of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church," delivered in November at the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Society; and this is succeeded by a synopsis of the late session of the General Missionary Committee. This number of the periodical is of much value to readers.—The *Review of Reviews* for December, like all of its predecessors, is rich in its summaries. The earth's doings for a month are here put in a nutshell. Every man who would keep in touch with the great world should read it and its successors.—The *Homiletic Review* for December has among its articles: "Richard Hooker, the Elizabethan Ecclesiastic," by Professor T. W. Hunt, of Princeton, N. J.; "Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries—The Rivers of Paradise," by Dr. W. H. Ward, of New York city; a sermon on "Prayer as a Factor in Public Affairs," by J. E. Rankin, D.D., of Washington, D. C.; and a sermon on "The Lesson of the Transitory," by J. D. Wells, D.D., of Brooklyn, N. Y. The various departments of the issue are well filled.—*Christian Literature* for November opens with a paper on "The Ideal in Church Unity," by R. De Witt Mallary. Some of its following articles are on "The Alleged Sojourn of Christ in India," by Max Müller; "Religious Reserve on the Subject of Heaven," by Prebendary Whitefoord; "The Law of Moses," by A. B. Bruce, D.D.; "The Hardness of the Christian Life," by Dr. R. W. Dale; "Professor W. Robertson Smith's Doctrine of Scripture," by T. M. Lindsay, D.D.; and "A Century of German Theology," by James Stalker, D.D. Not the least noticeable among the papers is the curious correspondence between Cardinal Gibbons and the Rev. G. W. King on Christian union.—The *Methodist Magazine* for December has matter so readable along the lines of travel and Christian experience as to make it an eminently worthy visitor to the Canadian fireside.—The *Church at Home and Abroad* is published monthly by order of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. Its December issue has as contributed articles: "Observance of the Lord's Day in Venice," by Alexander Robertson, D.D.; "Indians of Arizona," by Rev. C. H. Cook; and "Threatened Uprising of the Neglected Classes," by Rev. W. P. Chalfant. Its illustrations and notes on home and foreign missions combine with its subject-matter to make it valuable as a denominational monthly.—The *Treasury* for December is crowded with good things. In "Leading Sermonic Thoughts" is an extract from Dr. Lyman Abbott. The fourth of the series of biographical notices of the presidents of Yale describes Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D. Its writer is Dr. Burdett Hart. Dr. T. L. Cuyler gives his third paper on "Some Elements of Pulpit Power," and Professor G. H. Schodde writes on "Finds in Early Christian Literature." An article on "Tarsus," by the Rev. H. S. Jenanyan, is also accompanied by a recent picture of that historic place.

BOOK NOTICES.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Assyrian Echoes of the Word. By REV. THOMAS LAURIE, D.D. With Illustrations. 8vo, pp. 380. New York: American Tract Society. Price, cloth, \$2.

Genesis and Semitic Tradition. By JOHN D. DAVIS, Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament History in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. 8vo, pp. 150. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

History, Prophecy, and the Monuments. By JAMES FREDERICK MCCURDY, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Oriental Languages in University College, Toronto. Volume I: To the Downfall of Samaria. 8vo, pp. 425. New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, \$3.

It is surprising that the interest in the relations between the Assyrians and the Hebrews shows no sign of diminishing. It was to be expected that great popular interest should be aroused by the stirring discoveries of Rawlinson, Smith, and their contemporaries; but those discoveries were long since worked over by scholars and set into popular form. But that the interest should survive, nay, increase, is surprising and suggestive. It is another proof, not of the undying interest of antiquity, but of the amazing hold of the Bible on the minds not only of the common people, but also of the people who read books. These are always thirsting for some new or fresh word illustrative of their dearest book. And the writers and makers of books are always seeking to supply their recognized demand. But in spite of the fact that so many books have been written on this subject it must be confessed that none are exactly suitable. Some of them are valuable in one way and some in another. But there is no single book yet that covers accurately and interestingly the whole field. Three new candidates for popular favor are here grouped together for a surveying and a testing of their merits and defects. The researches of Assyriologists have been especially useful to Old Testament study in two departments—in lexicography and in history. The greatest leaders in the world in these two departments are Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, of Breslau, and Professor Eberhard Schrader, of Berlin—the former in lexicography, the latter in history. They have both written monumental works illustrating the Old Testament by means of the Assyrian inscriptions. But these works are primarily written for scholars, and are not well adapted for the ordinary reader or the average intelligent student of the Bible. There was and is a pressing need for the presentation in popular form of the chief results of these and other independent and original investigators. Does any one of these three books supply the whole or any part of this need? The first of them was written by a man born in the East, whose interest in these questions is as old as his conscious touch with the world's life. That is a distinct gain to his portrayal of the light that comes upon an oriental book from the inscriptions of an oriental people. The book is arranged topically, the topics are placed in alphabetical order, and the subjects are so treated as to require but little cross refer-

ence. A few of its subjects will give an idea of the scope of the book: "Abednego;" "Abraham;" "Adrammelech;" "Ahab;" "Alphabet;" "Altar;" "Angel, Destroying;" "Anointing;" "Apparel, Royal;" "Appiryon." In this way every word in the Bible which can be illustrated by the Assyrian inscriptions is put down in alphabetical order and followed by a short statement of its illustration by those inscriptions. It is wonderful how many passages, how many customs, how many words, how many historical episodes are here admirably illustrated from the Assyrian inscriptions. It may be regarded as a sort of supplementary volume to the usual Bible dictionaries which find place upon the shelves of biblical students. The book shows a good acquaintance with the literature of Assyriology in English, and gives references to a few of the more notable German works; but it must be said that the author seems to be unacquainted with by far the largest part of the best German and French books on the subject, and in so far his book is behind the times and, therefore, not thoroughly reliable. The method of transliteration employed in representing Assyrian words is not scientific. It follows the older English Assyriologists, and not the more generally adopted system of the present. Some of the translations, also, need revision to bring them up with the present state of Assyrian work. The work is, on the whole, so well done that it seems almost ungracious to find fault with it; but the reader ought to be guarded against a too ready acceptance of its conclusions without further testing. For example, the passages quoted under "Monotheism" really only prove that henotheism, quite a different thing, may possibly be found in some early Assyrian texts. In the article on "Pul" use should have been made of Rost's admirable new edition of Tiglath-pileser III, and under "Months" Arnolt's papers ought to have been cited. There is no Scripture index, a most unfortunate lack, so that one cannot quickly determine whether the book has comments on a passage or not, for sometimes the illustration stands under quite a different word or phrase from that found in the text. It is a useful, but not an ideal book. Of the second book named above we must regretfully say that it is a disappointment. As the title indicates, it deals only with the illustrations of the Book of Genesis from the Assyrian inscriptions. Now, the Assyrian inscriptions which cast light upon Genesis are chiefly religious texts, and these are proverbially very difficult to translate and interpret. When Dr. Davis essayed this task he undertook the most difficult task which can come to an Assyriologist's hand. It seems to us that he was not equal to so difficult a piece of work. The book is unequal. The chapter on "The Deluge" is by far the best in the book; it shows a very careful study of the fragmentary and difficult flood texts, and is especially valuable in its sifting of the translations of others. We do not find much that is original in it; but Haupt, Jensen, and Hommel have been studied thoroughly and used critically. This chapter is the best discussion of its subject that we have in English. On the other hand, the chapters on the "Creation of the Universe" and on the site of the "Garden of Eden" are not such good specimens, and betray some of the author's limitations. In the latter chapter we do not

regard the criticism of Delitzsch as successful. The "conclusion of the whole matter" concerning Eden seems to verge strongly on Haupt's view;* but we suppose that Dr. Davis had not seen his curious paper. As Haupt has now partially changed his view, though he previously considered the matter as "certain," perhaps Davis has not missed much through his inability to read that learned but unsatisfactory hypothesis. We are glad that Davis thinks the writer of Genesis knew some geography and honestly seeks to find out what he meant, and not to pick flaws as Haupt has done. It seems to us that no view yet published is equal to that advocated with such learning and reasonableness by Delitzsch. The spirit of the book is thoroughly good. The treatment of the sacred book is reverent and straightforward, and there seems to be an honest seeking for the truth. We must say, however, that the flippant reference to Professor Sayce, in a footnote on page 109, is ungrateful and misleading. No man who dares to write of Assyrian religious texts can be anything but a great debtor to Sayce, who led the way in the study of them. Has Dr. Davis read Jensen so much that he has imbibed some of his stupid hatred of "the Englishman?" The third book in our list is easily the first in rank and importance. We are as much surprised at its worth as we are disappointed in the work of Dr. Davis. Dr. McCurdy is a well-trained man, a graduate, we believe, of Princeton College, as well as of the Seminary. After that he studied with Franz Delitzsch at Leipzig, where he did good work and left pleasant memories and high hopes for his success. There was, therefore, much disappointment when he published in 1881 his *Aryo-Semitic Speech*—a discussion of the supposed relations between the Indo-European and Semitic languages. That book was very good of its kind, a much better book than the elder Delitzsch's *Jesurun* on the same subject; but it was philological heresy, nevertheless, and made McCurdy's friends fear that he had departed from sound methods of research and was going a-hunting for theories rather than for facts. The present book is a complete refutation of that slanderous fear. It is a solid and sound contribution to a very important subject. The former books were intended to illustrate texts of Scripture; this is primarily intended to shed light on the movement of Old Testament history. "Its aim is to help those into whose hands it may fall to apprehend in its true relations the history of that ancient people through whom the world has gained most of its heritage of moral and spiritual light and power;" so says the Preface. And further on it is written: "The present work seeks to tell as simply as possible the story of the ancient Semitic peoples, including as the dominating theme the fortunes of Israel. If the recital turns out to be virtually a history of a well-defined portion of Western Asia in the olden times the circumstance will, I trust, be found to be more than a coincidence." These are brave words, but there is a good basis of justification for them in the first volume, which lies before us. We think that we know of abler books on the history of Babylonia and Assyria, or on the history of Phœnicia or of Israel separately considered;

* Proceedings of the American Oriental Society, vol. xvi, p. ciii.

ence. A few of its subjects will give an idea of the scope of the book: "Abednego;" "Abraham;" "Adrammelech;" "Ahab;" "Alphabet;" "Altar;" "Angel, Destroying;" "Anointing;" "Apparel, Royal;" "Appiryon." In this way every word in the Bible which can be illustrated by the Assyrian inscriptions is put down in alphabetical order and followed by a short statement of its illustration by those inscriptions. It is wonderful how many passages, how many customs, how many words, how many historical episodes are here admirably illustrated from the Assyrian inscriptions. It may be regarded as a sort of supplementary volume to the usual Bible dictionaries which find place upon the shelves of biblical students. The book shows a good acquaintance with the literature of Assyriology in English, and gives references to a few of the more notable German works; but it must be said that the author seems to be unacquainted with by far the largest part of the best German and French books on the subject, and in so far his book is behind the times and, therefore, not thoroughly reliable. The method of transliteration employed in representing Assyrian words is not scientific. It follows the older English Assyriologists, and not the more generally adopted system of the present. Some of the translations, also, need revision to bring them up with the present state of Assyrian work. The work is, on the whole, so well done that it seems almost ungracious to find fault with it; but the reader ought to be guarded against a too ready acceptance of its conclusions without further testing. For example, the passages quoted under "Monotheism" really only prove that henotheism, quite a different thing, may possibly be found in some early Assyrian texts. In the article on "Pul" use should have been made of Rost's admirable new edition of Tiglath-pileser III, and under "Months" Arnolt's papers ought to have been cited. There is no Scripture index, a most unfortunate lack, so that one cannot quickly determine whether the book has comments on a passage or not, for sometimes the illustration stands under quite a different word or phrase from that found in the text. It is a useful, but not an ideal book. Of the second book named above we must regretfully say that it is a disappointment. As the title indicates, it deals only with the illustrations of the Book of Genesis from the Assyrian inscriptions. Now, the Assyrian inscriptions which cast light upon Genesis are chiefly religious texts, and these are proverbially very difficult to translate and interpret. When Dr. Davis essayed this task he undertook the most difficult task which can come to an Assyriologist's hand. It seems to us that he was not equal to so difficult a piece of work. The book is unequal. The chapter on "The Deluge" is by far the best in the book; it shows a very careful study of the fragmentary and difficult flood texts, and is especially valuable in its sifting of the translations of others. We do not find much that is original in it; but Haupt, Jensen, and Hommel have been studied thoroughly and used critically. This chapter is the best discussion of its subject that we have in English. On the other hand, the chapters on the "Creation of the Universe" and on the site of the "Garden of Eden" are not such good specimens, and betray some of the author's limitations. In the latter chapter we do not

regard the criticism of Delitzsch as successful. The "conclusion of the whole matter" concerning Eden seems to verge strongly on Haupt's view;* but we suppose that Dr. Davis had not seen his curious paper. As Haupt has now partially changed his view, though he previously considered the matter as "certain," perhaps Davis has not missed much through his inability to read that learned but unsatisfactory hypothesis. We are glad that Davis thinks the writer of Genesis knew some geography and honestly seeks to find out what he meant, and not to pick flaws as Haupt has done. It seems to us that no view yet published is equal to that advocated with such learning and reasonableness by Delitzsch. The spirit of the book is thoroughly good. The treatment of the sacred book is reverent and straightforward, and there seems to be an honest seeking for the truth. We must say, however, that the flippant reference to Professor Sayce, in a footnote on page 109, is ungrateful and misleading. No man who dares to write of Assyrian religious texts can be anything but a great debtor to Sayce, who led the way in the study of them. Has Dr. Davis read Jensen so much that he has imbibed some of his stupid hatred of "the Englishman?" The third book in our list is easily the first in rank and importance. We are as much surprised at its worth as we are disappointed in the work of Dr. Davis. Dr. McCurdy is a well-trained man, a graduate, we believe, of Princeton College, as well as of the Seminary. After that he studied with Franz Delitzsch at Leipzig, where he did good work and left pleasant memories and high hopes for his success. There was, therefore, much disappointment when he published in 1881 his *Aryo-Semitic Speech*—a discussion of the supposed relations between the Indo-European and Semitic languages. That book was very good of its kind, a much better book than the elder Delitzsch's *Jesurun* on the same subject; but it was philological heresy, nevertheless, and made McCurdy's friends fear that he had departed from sound methods of research and was going a-hunting for theories rather than for facts. The present book is a complete refutation of that slanderous fear. It is a solid and sound contribution to a very important subject. The former books were intended to illustrate texts of Scripture; this is primarily intended to shed light on the movement of Old Testament history. "Its aim is to help those into whose hands it may fall to apprehend in its true relations the history of that ancient people through whom the world has gained most of its heritage of moral and spiritual light and power;" so says the Preface. And further on it is written: "The present work seeks to tell as simply as possible the story of the ancient Semitic peoples, including as the dominating theme the fortunes of Israel. If the recital turns out to be virtually a history of a well-defined portion of Western Asia in the olden times the circumstance will, I trust, be found to be more than a coincidence." These are brave words, but there is a good basis of justification for them in the first volume, which lies before us. We think that we know of abler books on the history of Babylonia and Assyria, or on the history of Phœnicia or of Israel separately considered;

* Proceedings of the American Oriental Society, vol. xvi, p. ciii.

but we know of no book so able and interesting in which the histories of all these and of still other peoples are treated together in their mutual relations and with special reference to the varying fortunes of Israel. There are certain matters in which we cannot agree with McCurdy, but they are chiefly matters of detail and not of great importance. But what reason is there for his new transcriptions of well-known oriental names? Here, for example, we find "Sinacherib" for our well known "Sennacherib," and "Hettites" for "Hittites." It seems to us that this savors of pedantry, for absolutely nothing of consequence is gained in either case. "Sinacherib" does, indeed, represent the Assyrian just a shade better than the ordinary English form, but the gain is so slight that it surely does not justify the departure from usage in a word so thoroughly anglicized. In the case of the Hittites it is still worse; for we are absolutely ignorant of the name which this people possessed in their own language, and to change to "Hettites" is only representing the Hebrew form of their name a little more perfectly. It will be time enough to change the word "Hittites" when we are able to read their own inscriptions. Is not Jensen now proposing to call their inscriptions Hattite or Cilician? Let us retain all forms of words which are thoroughly anglicized, unless there is great gain in making a change. The first chapter of the book, entitled "The Semites in History," contains some good material, well presented. It was plainly written by a believer in the divine origin of Christianity and of Judaism, and that is a distinct gain in these days. Witness, for example, these words: "Incontestably the best thoughts and principles—the most profound, the most propulsive, the most potential—that men have ever cherished have been conceived and elaborated in Semitic minds. Nay, more, the world has not yet fathomed the depths of these thoughts nor fully tested the applicability of these principles to the social and personal needs of any generation of men." There is more of the same sort all through the book. It is reverent but progressive, learned but interesting, accurate in detail but bold and picturesque in the whole. We shall await the second volume with impatience and hopefulness. The present volume contains: "Book I, The Northern Semites; Book II, The Babylonians; Book III, Canaanites, Egyptians, and Hettites; Book IV, Assyrians and Babylonians; Book V, Hebrews, Canaanites, and Aramæans; Book VI, Hebrews, Aramæans, and Assyrians." The second volume will contain: "Book VII, Hebrews, Egyptians, and Assyrians; Book VIII, Hebrews and Chaldeans; Book IX, Hebrews and Persians."

Christianity and the Christ. A Study of Christian Evidences. By BRADFORD PAUL RAYMOND, D.D., President of the Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 12mo, pp. 250. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price, cloth, 85 cents.

This book would do credit to any college president. Its purpose is "to show that the Christian faith is reasonable. The whole subject is made to revolve around the Christ." "It is the convergence of all lines in Christ that makes faith reasonable." "Our religious ideals are rational, and must, therefore, be met. The only alternative is blank skepticism." "If Christ continues to satisfy these ideals the race will continue to

believe in him and to recite its creed, 'I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.' That this notice may represent the book as it is and give our readers such an idea of its value as shall most surely make them its purchasers and readers we transcribe the outline of its twelve chapters, packed solid with coherent truth: I. "CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Christianity revolves around the Christ—Christianity a spiritual life—Related to the whole man." II. "CHRIST AND THE REVISED VERSION. The Revised Version and the Gospel of the second century—The outcome of scholarly work in this field—Another witness [Paul]—Variations in the manuscript." III. "CHRIST AND THE PROPHETS. The Prophets—The starting point and the goal—The historic movement—Progress in ideals—Predictive prophecies—The suffering servant of Jehovah." IV. "CHRIST AND THE SUPERNATURAL. Miracles denied—General considerations—Miracles and their context—The matchless character." V. "CHRIST'S SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS. The assumptions he makes." VI. "CHRIST AND THE RESURRECTION. Various naturalistic theories—Renan's theory." VII. "CHRIST AND THE APOSTLE PAUL. Paul's conversion and life—Renan's account—The great change." VIII. "CHRIST AND THE SINNER. Sin—Christ's answer to the question." IX. "CHRIST AND THE BELIEVER. Our experience—The great facts of experience—This life, how sustained—The meaning of our religious ideals." X. "CHRIST AND HISTORY. Christ's theory of man and its relation to slavery—The period of the Reformation—The Wesleyan revival." XI. "CHRIST AND HUMANITY. The claim of Christianity and its reasons—Heathenism." XII. "CHRIST AND IMMORTALITY. The question of the ages—Revelation needed." We have here Christian apologetics in marching and fighting trim, with full necessary militant equipment, but carrying no superfluous and dispensable luggage. The book is the work of a thinker of philosophic insight and grasp, who is able to reach the law behind facts and the principles underlying laws; who has read widely and thoroughly in the literature related to his theme and, by numerous references, points his readers to the large fields from which he has gleaned; who is not only acquainted with all materials, but master of them, and whose work upon materials has been not agglutination, but assimilation, by processes of mental and spiritual digestion eliminating and excreting the irrelevant and unsuitable, while absorbing into his circulation and vitalizing all affinitive and nutritive substances; who is familiar with the freshest thought and the results of modern critical study and speaks the dialect which is intelligible to his intellectual contemporaries, producing a book which has the manners, dress, and speech that will make it acceptable and at home in the twentieth century; who understands the hesitations, bewilderments, difficulties, and denials of to-day and addresses them with precision and incision; who has a skilled educator's art of simplified and stimulating statement; who knows the way of approach to and advance through the mind and heart of young manhood, the gates and streets of the city of Mansoul; whose reasoning is

incandescent with an evangelic glow, radiating light and heat; who shows a poetic sensibility to every embodiment and manifestation of the beautiful, the true, and the good. President Raymond's book delivers, as in one swift and solid blow, the overwhelming force of the Christian argument. Its literary style is marked by conciseness, simplicity, purity, and beauty. It needs not our praise; it shines by its own light. We only point to it and say that we do not know where else so much value can be had for eighty-five cents.

The Johannine Theology. A Study of the Doctrinal Contents of the Gospel and Epistles of the Apostle John. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Yale University. Crown 8vo, pp. 387. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, cloth, \$2.

This volume belongs to that small class of books which are a real acquisition to any minister's library, and which, indeed, he can hardly do without. It belongs to that growing department of modern study called biblical theology. It is vital on every page with the true spirit of modern scholarship. The careful study of the human element in Scripture increasingly commends itself to nearly all thinkers of the present day. That there is a very large "subjective element in the fourth Gospel," that "the apostle has given us this teaching in his own words and in the shape and color which it had assumed through long reflection upon its contents and meaning," seems evident to Professor Stevens. The author labors under a considerable disadvantage which he did not meet in the preparation of the companion volume, issued two years ago, on *The Pauline Theology*; for, as he well says on the last page of the book, "We can hardly speak of a Johannine *system* at all, and we are left to correlate as best we can the *disjecta membra* of doctrine which John has left us in his writings." The difficult task is well done. The salient features of the special type of teaching found in the epistle and gospel known as John's are clearly and adequately set forth under such headings as "The Doctrine of Love," "The Doctrine of Sin," "The Doctrine of Prayer," "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," "The Idea of God in the Writings of John," "The Johannine Eschatology." The first chapter, "The Peculiarities of John's Theology," and the last chapter, "The Theology of John and of Paul Compared," are especially valuable. Since nearly all the verses, all which contain doctrine, in the gospel and first epistle are discussed under one head or another, the volume serves as the very best sort of a commentary on these two important books. It affords, in fact, a well-digested synopsis of all the opinions that have been given by the best writers on the many disputed points that occur in the interpretation of John. The author holds the balance even, and exhibits most excellent judgment in the decisions he makes—decisions which in almost every case easily carry the assent of the reader. No one will regret intrusting himself to this guide as he endeavors to find his way through the theological thickets of the New Testament. Honest, straightforward, discriminative, judicious, impartial, clear, and comprehensive, the author's conclusions will not readily be reversed. He has laid the public under much obligation by this pub-

lication. We add the comment of another reviewer upon Professor Stevens's book: "The only critical, systematic exposition of John's theology worth mention in English or in recent German theological literature. Weiss is hardly an exception. Recognizing the differences between the types of the Johannine and the Pauline theology and the far greater effect of the latter on the dogmatic development of the Church, Professor Stevens is able in his admirable analysis and comparison to reduce this difference to one of type or form rather than of substantial contradiction. The work is masterly and stands alone."

Inspiration. Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration, being the Bampton Lectures for 1893. By W. SANDAY, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Professor of Exegesis, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Second edition. 8vo, pp. 464. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, \$4.

These lectures appropriately and naturally follow the author's previous volume on *The Nature and Extent of Biblical Inspiration*. Their aim is to furnish a general view which shall cover as far as possible the data, at once new and old, which go to determine the conception which thoughtful men would form of the Bible. "To everybody who is confident of the outcome it is a thrilling thing to see the intellect and learning of the world focused upon the Bible. That is the spectacle on which the twentieth century will look when it arrives, and it will perceive no pallor of fear, no trace of timidity, on the faces of the friends of Jesus Christ. Professor Sanday's spirit and position may be inferred from some of his introductory statements. "It is becoming almost a commonplace to say that our conception of what the Bible is should be drawn, in the first instance, from what the biblical writers say of themselves." "The writer is conscious of having criticised most freely some of those for whom he has the highest respect. This applies particularly to some of the German scholars whose names deservedly carry the greatest weight in England. There are none to whom he is himself more indebted; but he does not wish them to impose upon his countrymen, by the weight of authority, views which do not seem to be borne out by the evidence." "In view of the body of Old Testament criticism, the writer's own position is tentative and provisional. He does not think that the great revolution which seems to be expected in some quarters, from the Tell-el-Amarna tablets or otherwise, is probable; at the same time his impression is that the criticism of the near future is likely to be more conservative in its tendency than it has been, or, at least, to do fuller justice to the positive data than it has done. In regard to the New Testament he has tried to state the case as objectively as possible. He has thus been led rather to understate than to overstate the results which seem to him to have been attained so far. But he believes that there is much still to be done; and he hopes most from the spirit which is not impatient for 'results,' which does not suppress or slur over difficulties in the critical view, any more than in the traditional, which lays its plans broadly, and is determined to make good the lesser steps before it attempts the greater." The book has a good index and a full synopsis of the contents of each lecture.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Wealth against Commonwealth. By HENRY DEMAREST LLOYD. 8vo, pp. 563. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$2.50.

The author undertakes to prove that the "cornerers," syndicates, trusts, and combinations are "holding back the riches of earth, sea, and sky from their fellows who famish and freeze in the dark," and "assert the right, for their private profit, to regulate the consumption by the people of the necessities of life and to control production, not by the needs of humanity, but by the desires of a few for dividends." This book might have been a very valuable one if it had been written with more discrimination. It is an effort to show that all wealth is gradually passing under the control of a few persons. There might be a candid and exact book having that object in view. We do not mean that the thesis could be proved, but the real arguments could be compactly arranged. The intelligent reader may learn much from Mr. Lloyd; but he will have to pick it out carefully and to do his work under the glare of a flamboyant rhetoric. This reader is liable to a serious mistake—that of supposing he has read and heard it all many times before, in periodicals and orations advocating socialism. But, though there is nothing new in the volume, the orderly arrangement of the matter and the fullness of the treatment make the work a useful one to a properly qualified reader. To the other kind of reader the book is sure to be as misleading as it is intemperate; it may give him an attack of its rabies. The author undertakes to describe trusts and monopolies by quotation from legislative reports. He ought to know that such reports have no sure value. They are in nearly every case partisan documents, designed to influence the next election. They contain evidence, but not all the evidence; and the conclusions are such as the majority of a committee may choose to draw out of their own consciousness. It is not a pleasant thing to say, but this reviewer cannot recall a single legislative report having a political aspect which has been trustworthy. The sources of our author's "facts" are, therefore, under suspicion. Bad as it is, even a whisky trust may be slandered. Quotations from judges are given as is other testimony, and these are good as far as they go. But a legal decision cannot be condensed into a few sentences, and single sentences exactly transcribed may be modified by other sentences not transcribed by our author. As an example of a legislative report, that of the Pennsylvania Legislature in 1871 is quoted from on page 17; but more than half the evils named on that page have ceased to exist or are found very rarely in 1894. A confusing thing in the author's quotations is, by the way, the ranging over two or three decades. The idea of progress in our accumulation of wealth requires proof that the trust is a worse thing in this year than it was in 1870. The truth is that all the bad side of the corporation was more fully displayed a quarter of a century ago. In some ways they are more useful, less burdensome, and less obnoxious than in 1870. The multiplication of corporations has maintained a large measure of competition among them. The real evil

is that, as at competing points on railways, the competition is disastrous; it destroys profits, and so impairs service and cuts into wages; and, looking at it broadly, the poverty of American railroad corporations is notorious and disproves some of the author's theories. Referring the qualified reader to the book itself for the author's special views, we hope to serve our public by a few suggestions respecting its subject-matter.

1. A corporation cannot raise prices at pleasure. The rise reduces demand, even for fire and light. 2. Corporations almost invariably reduce the cost of any service, and the public gets a part of this gain in the form of a lowered price. 3. Reducing the output may be to the general advantage; reducing it, we mean, by agreement. The object of such a reduction is usually to maintain prices, not to enhance them. The well-being of the workmen is concerned; and the public could only suffer from piling up a million tons of bar iron for which the country has no use. Regulation of the amount of a given product may be a blessing. 4. The corporation, the aggregation of capital, is civilization on the economic side. It does interfere with the individual. His stage line, his telegraph line, his oil mill, his coal mine, nay, even his wheat field, suffer from the entrance of a power which works at less cost and sells at a lower price. This suffering is compensated for the greater number by other gains. 5. But here and there a man is economically destroyed. He must practically give up his small coal mine or oil mill to the corporation. If he produces at a noncompeting point on a railroad he may be butchered by unequal freight rates. The big Dakota grain field may drive him out of the wheat business. Whether these individuals can be relieved is an interesting question. It is not so clear as it might be that we ought to fret over the matter. The stage driver may find other employment, and so of the rest. The real grievance along the whole line is that the corporation can serve the public more cheaply and still make larger profits. The trouble of the agitator in this field is often the simple fact that anyone but himself should make money or that some have made more than he. 6. There is a large body of just complaints against corporate bodies; but they are specific, local, and isolated. No man's grievance can be alleged unless civilization is to be arraigned, after the manner of the thoroughbred socialist. The greater part of this book is devoted to exposing the history of the Standard Oil Trust. It is not a history, but a virulent attack carried on by collecting all the testimony against it. And in all these "exposures" of organized wealth it may be noted that, if a witness does not say what he is asked to say, the committee reports that "the witness hesitated" or that he was evidently unwilling to tell the truth. There is another side of this "terrible monopoly." On that side are these facts: (1) Refined oil costs the consumer much less; (2) the trust is notable for the high wages it pays and the high grade of its servants; (3) the high Christian character of most of the men in the trust creates a presumption that most of the charges against them are false. No doubt such inventions as the pipe line have yielded an enormous bounty. We have looked very carefully through this book for some hint of a

remedy and have found none. In the last sentence we have one, perhaps: "In the hope of tapping some reserve of their powers of self-help this story is told to the people." The "story" in this one-sided form has been told often before, and we think the people have decided against the story-tellers; and the substance of their verdict is, "We do not believe you." If the story is true and is believed by the people, then there is no reserve of moral powers to tap. The *ex parte* character of the trial, testimony, and judgment is now known to the people, and therefore the people are going quietly about their business, trying to obtain the benefits of organized wealth with as few of the evils of unorganized wealth as possible. The workman knows that the "despotic master" is usually the employer of only one or two men, not the corporation employing ten thousand men. And, after all, the large interest of the people is not in the one man who wants to run a small mill at our expense, but in the ten thousand workmen who want the good temper and the good wages of the large corporations. A very interesting book, by the way, might be made by some one familiar with the tricks, greed, and despotism of the individual producer. The agitators seem to have forgotten all about him. Some good testimony about his meannesses may be found in the Bible.

Chapters from Some Unwritten Memoirs. By ANNA THACKERAY RITCHIE. 8vo, pp. 205. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, ornamental, gilt top, \$2.

These breezy and vivacious reminiscences of interesting and famous persons and places seem equally entertaining with the *Records of Tennyson, Ruskin, Browning*, which this daughter of Thackeray gave us in a previous volume. The first chapter is on "My Poet." His name was Jasmin, born at Agen, in the south of France, "of a humpback father and a halting mother, in the corner of an old street, in a crowded dwelling peopled by many rats." Longfellow translated some of his works. "My Musician" is Chopin. "My Triumphant Arch" is the Arc de Triomphe in Paris, around which Thackeray's daughter played in her childhood, under which strange processions have marched, and in sight of which surprising successions of events have made marvelous history. "My Professor of History" is a poor little, old, short, stumpy woman, who taught history to little girls and loved Paris so that, when the Prussians came, she gave all the money she had to help the city defend itself. "My Witches' Caldron" is a chapter of reminiscent odds and ends about Charlotte Brontë, Carlyle, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Palmerston, Gladstone, Samuel Rogers, Mademoiselle Sontag, and others. And the remainder of the book is like unto what we have noticed.

Riverby. By JOHN BURROUGHS. 16mo, pp. 319. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, ornamental, \$1.25.

John Burroughs comes nearer to being the priest of nature than any American now living. Perhaps we should say prophet, for he speaks for and expounds nature. He has not lived so much like a wild man as Thoreau, and is not so eccentric and bizarre to the ordinary mortal; but he has as deep a love for the non-human world, as exquisite a sensi-

bility to all its charms, and a finer gift for rich and bright, as well as minute, description. The author's pathetic intimation that this is probably his "last collection of out-of-door papers" lends a tender interest to these eighteen chapters. Burroughs is not a mere poetic devotee romancing about nature; he is a lifelong student of her ways and has scientific knowledge. His fascinating books instruct as much as they delight. "The Heart of the Southern Catskills," "Notes from the Prairie," "A Taste of Kentucky Blue Grass," "Bird Courtship," "Bird Life in an Apple Tree," "The Chipmunk," "A Young Marsh Hawk"—such are some of the things written about in these nature notes by the author of *Fresh Fields, Birds and Poets, Locusts and Wild Honey, Wake Robin, and Winter Sunshine*. This book is named *Riverby* because most of it was written beside that great and beautiful river which flows past John Burroughs's home—the Hudson of which Gilder writes:

O silver river flowing to the sea,
Strong, calm, and solemn as thy mountains be!
Poets have sung thy ever-living power,
Thy wintry day, and summer sunset hour;
Have told how rich thou art, how broad, how deep;
What commerce thine, how many myriads reap
The harvest of thy waters. They have sung

The waving outline of thy wooded mountains,
Thy populous towns that stretch from forest fountains,
On either side, far to the salty main,
Like golden coins alternate on a chain.
Thou pathway of the empire of the north,
Thy praises through the earth have traveled forth!

The Select Works of Benjamin Franklin, including his Autobiography. Edited, with Notes and a Memoir, by EPES SARGENT. 12mo, pp. 502. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

The editor of this volume has rendered his countrymen a great service by placing Franklin within reach of everyone. This volume contains all the purely literary work of the one American who must always rank next to Washington. He was, indeed, a broader man than the general and president. He was illustrious before the Revolution as a man of science and letters. Twenty years before, Kent called him "the Prometheus of modern times," and Bancroft says, "He was the true father of the American Union." We do not always realize that he was seventy years old in 1776, and that through the previous decade he had been shaping the mind of the colonies, or that he won distinction as a diplomatist after that ripe age, entering that career as the representative of a people not yet admitted to the family of nations. Two circumstances have doubtless contributed to delay his entrance into the fullest honor. One is that he had the gift of wit; and for some strange reason that impairs a philosopher's fame. The other is the "freedom" of his supposed religious beliefs. He was, in fact, a Unitarian; but his enemies called him an infidel, and the accu-

sation stuck to his earlier posthumous fame. Every young American ought to be familiar with Franklin's works, and a revival of his fame may be expected to follow the wide circulation of Mr. Sargent's book. Franklin is, in the estimation of some, the most interesting man this country has produced, and he has put this interesting himself into his writings.

The Meeting-Place of Geology and History. By SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL.D., F.R.S., Author of *The Earth and Man*, etc. 12mo, pp. 223. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

Orthodoxy and liberality go hand in hand in the present treatise. By no means does the author seek to disparage the attainments of science, but, on the contrary, holds a generous attitude toward its claims. For revelation, however, he shows such a reverential regard as is almost unusual in these days of Pentateuchal criticism and the frequent exaltation of geology above the Scriptures. In summary his conclusions are as follows: 1. There is "no link of derivation connecting man with the lower animals which preceded him." He is "a new departure in creation." 2. He has "a lower (psychical) intelligence, similar to that of the inferior animals," and "a spiritual nature allying him with higher intelligences, and with God himself." 3. While man, as to his body, is an animal and earthly, he is "the sole species of his genus and of his family, or order." The "missing links" have not been found. 4. There is no fact of science "more certainly established than the recency of man in geological time." 5. Man's first appearance "cannot, perhaps, be fixed within a few years or centuries, either by human chronology or by the science of the earth." 6. There is "but one species of man, though many races and varieties." 7. It is probable that the precise locality of man's origin was in a temperate region. 8. The "diluvial interlude gives a double origin of man." 9. The historical deluge may be correlated with "the great geographical changes which closed the palanthropic age." From this outline the scope of the volume will be seen. Mr. Dawson's treatment is characteristically able.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

George William Curtis. By EDWARD CARY. 12mo, pp. 343. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, with portrait, \$1.25.

This is the thirteenth of the biographies of "American Men of Letters" edited by Charles Dudley Warner. In it the history of the ideal life of a "knightly gentleman and a great citizen" is given with delicate discrimination. Never had sculptor or biographer a finer manliness to model statue or story from than that which adorned, enriched, ennobled, educated, and immensely assisted the world in the person of George William Curtis. In him, as in many, his youth was the fair prophecy of his manhood. From eighteen to twenty he was a boarder at West Roxbury, a sort of associate member of that motley community of semi-industrious idealists at Brook Farm who illuminated the potato

patch with Attic wit, talked Greek philosophy in the cornfield, and "scratched weeds out of the ground to the music of Tennyson or Browning;" of which classic-bucolic settlement Emerson wrote, more rhetorically than correctly, "It was a French Revolution in small, an Age of Reason in a patty-pan." A lady remembers approaching a Brook Farm gate which was politely held open by a handsome young fellow named Charles A. Dana; and near him she saw two young men who, as she remembers them, looked like young Greek gods, with long hair falling to the shoulders in irregular curls. They were the Curtis brothers, Burrill, the elder, and George, the younger. Though the agricultural picnic at Brook Farm was regarded by the outside world as a colony of very queer people, if not lunatics, Curtis got nothing there but good. It was an inspiration to all that was noble in him, and did not make him so visionary as to prevent his subsequent life from being, in its fullness, powerfully practical. Those early years gave him associations with Emerson, Hawthorne, Channing, Thoreau, Alcott, Margaret Fuller. He caught the passion for high intellectual ideals and a literary spirit which, with travel-years added, made him the author of *Nile Notes of a Howadji*, *The Howadji in Syria*, *The Potiphar Papers*, *Prue and I*, and *Lotus Eating*, and for long years the editor of *Harper's Weekly* and the occupant of the matchless "Easy Chair" in the *Monthly*. To many of us Curtis on the lecture platform is a vivid and charming memory of the great days when Chapin, Emerson, Henry Giles, Beecher, Gough, Starr King, Phillips, and Sumner were flooding the land with splendid eloquence. We recognize the accuracy of this portrait: "His charm was felt the moment he arose. His form was manly, powerfully built, and exquisitely graceful. His head was of noble cast and bearing; his features strongly marked, finely chiseled, and, in his later years, almost rugged; forehead square, broad, and of vigorous lines; eyes blue-gray, large, and deep-set under prominent and slightly shaggy brows, lighting the shadow with flame, now gentle and glancing, now profound and burning. His voice was a most fortunate organ, deep, musical, yielding without effort the happy inflections suited to the thought, clear and bright in the lighter passages, alternately tender and flutelike, ringing like a bugle or vibrating in solemn organ tones that hushed the intense emotion it had aroused. His gestures were few and simple; nothing of the 'action' that the trained orator studies so carefully; no effort to sustain the attention of an audience, as Everett did, with a skill an actor might envy; none of the restless and irrepressible movement which in Beecher accompanied the rush and torrent of his eloquence. The speaker, unheeding the eyes, seemed to be seeking the judgment and the heart of his auditors." Not for twenty years did he spend a winter at home, but was on the road lecturing; at first, for an object which recalls the labors of Sir Walter Scott in his old age, for which object he sometimes earned \$2,000 in a two-months' lecture tour; and, later, for the sake of the nation in its peril. A letter to him from a facetious friend describes him as one who whirls over the land, "nightly vomits fire and ribbons for the satis-

faction of gaping multitudes, rushes into small fishing towns to fascinate the alewives, and illuminates little villages whereunto gas had never previously been brought." A responsive gayety of spirit rings merrily in his own letter from Milwaukee, in December, 1853: "My dear deluded Eastern: Why do you stay in that dried-up, old-fogyish East? A man is nothing if not a squatter upon the prairies; for . . . I have seen a prairie, I have darted all day across a prairie, I have been near the Mississippi, I have been invited to Iowa, which lies somewhere over the western horizon. I feel as all the people feel in novels—I confess the West. Great it is and greatly to be praised." Curtis was deeply and highly religious. He sometimes conducted the service in the church he attended. His faith declared itself in a private letter, thus: "I believe in God, who is love; that all men are brothers; and that the only essential duty of every man is to be honest, by which I understand his absolute following of his conscience when duly enlightened. I do not believe that God is anxious for men to believe this or that theory of the Godhead or of the Divine Government, but that they should live purely, justly, and lovingly." The life of Curtis, as Mr. Cary portrays it, is a powerful and impressive lesson in patriotism. His sympathy was with liberty everywhere. Looking across the sea in 1860 from his home on Staten Island, where Garibaldi once lived, he wrote: "How grandly Garibaldi stalks through that magnificent, moribund Italy, each step giving her life and hope. When I speak of liberty on the Fourth I shall not forget the soap-boiler of Staten Island." But his love for his own country was an intense and mighty passion. Whenever danger threatened her from outward foe or inward corruption, his action was as if he had heard the advice of Sir Philip Sidney to a younger brother, "Whenever you hear of a good war, go to it." George William Curtis was for twenty-five years as superb and valiant a citizen as Charles H. Parkhurst is now, and the imperial State and city to which he gave the noblest labors of a noble life need to have his spotless fame statued in some public place in whitest marble, to offset the shame of vulgar vanity and virulent partisanship memorialized in brass. Curtis's loyalty merged the lesser in the larger, individual in party, party in country, nation in mankind, mankind in God. He showed us the scholar, the gentleman, the idealist, the moralist in practical politics, working decade after decade, like a day laborer, at the roughest drudgery of citizenship, in the sturdy determination to put conscience, honor, and independence, as well as brains, into public life and to drive venality, vulgarity, and brutality out. He was not moved by self-seeking. A nation proud of him, and wishing both to avail itself of his splendid abilities and to exhibit the flower of American manhood to the European world, tempted him in vain with the offer of an appointment to any foreign mission he would select. He wrote, modestly, "I think no man ever had so much favor for so small desert." Curtis calls Lincoln "the greatest of modern Americans." He counted Alexander Hamilton "one of the greatest of our great men, as Jefferson was the least of the truly great. Hamilton was generous and sincere. Was Jefferson either?"

Curtis often repeated, as a model of eloquence and an expression of lofty sentiment, the peroration of Emerson's Dartmouth address: "Gentlemen, I have ventured to offer you these considerations upon the scholar's place and hope, because I thought that, standing, as many of you now do, on the threshold of this college, girt and ready to go and assume tasks, public and private, in your country, you would not be sorry to be admonished of those primary duties of the intellect whereof you will seldom hear from the lips of your new companions. You will hear every day the maxims of a low prudence. You will hear that the first duty is to get land and money, place and name. 'What is this truth you seek? what is this beauty?' men will ask with derision. If, nevertheless, God have called any of you to explore truth and beauty, be bold, be firm, be true. When you shall say, 'As others do, so will I; I renounce, I am sorry for it, my early visions; I must eat the good of the land and let romantic expectations go until a more convenient season,' then dies the man in you; then once more perish the buds of art and poetry and science, as they have died already in a thousand thousand men. The hour of that choice is the crisis of your history; and see that you hold yourself fast by the intellect." Truly it is said of Curtis that, from his address on "The Duty of the American Scholar to Politics and the Times," at Wesleyan University in 1856, when he was thirty-two years old, to his memorial oration on James Russell Lowell at New York in 1892, the last year of his life, there was not a lecture or address of his that was not intended to set forth a high ideal, to apply to some duty actually pressing, and to stir and strengthen human hearts for the duty imposed. The proof of this may be found in the three volumes of his *Orations and Addresses*, published by the Harpers last year. They are a treasury of noble eloquence. Put them with this volume, just issued by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., and we have the measure and the meaning of a magnificent manhood dedicated to great purposes. Worthy to be cherished in every crisis by men of all sections and all parties are the wise words of Curtis in his brief speech at the dinner of the New England Society of New York, at the height of the excitement when Congress was trying to decide whether Tilden or Hayes had been lawfully elected President. His subject was "The Puritan Principle: Liberty under the Law," and he said: "The Puritan principle in its essence is simply individual freedom. From that spring religious liberty and political equality. The free State, the free Church, the free school—these are the triple armor of American nationality, of American security. But the Pilgrims, while they have stood above all men for this idea of liberty, have always asserted liberty under law, and never separated it from law. . . . I stand here as a son of New England. In every fiber of my being I am a child of the Pilgrim." And then he added that the message of New England to the Congress of the nation in that crisis was "a message like that which Patrick Henry sent from Virginia to Massachusetts when he heard of Concord and Lexington: 'I am not a Virginian; I am an American.' And so, gentlemen, at this hour we are

not Republicans, we are not Democrats, we are Americans." If George William Curtis had been one of the knights of the Round Table, the *Idylls of the King* would have told us that the blameless Arthur was never left without one worthy mate, and that the angels had two brothers at Arthur's court. Cary's life of Curtis is a book to be put in as collateral reading to every college course and to be placed in every library that youth has access to, for it will ennoble the character of every young man that reads it.

A Primer of Assyriology. By A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. Price, cloth, 40 cents.

From one point of view, it is surprising how long a time is required to secure for popular use an accurate statement of scientific achievements. From another point of view, it is not surprising, but perfectly natural, for the simple reason that the only men who are competent to write accurate statements of scientific achievements are original investigators themselves, and they are too much absorbed in advancing knowledge to be able to give energy to its popularizing. Of all the sciences which claim and deserve modern attention scarcely one has been so badly presented in popular form as Assyriology. There have been numerous treatises on the results of Assyriology in their bearing on the Old Testament, most of them bad; but in English there has been no comprehensive, accurate, interesting, and popular review of the whole field of that science. At last there appears a primer which meets every one of these requirements. It is written by a master of the science, for Professor Sayce has himself made large and important contributions to the development of Assyriology. But, great as his services have been in original investigation, they have not blinded his eyes to any portion of the field. He knows what has been done by all other workers and is properly appreciative of the smallest contributions of his humblest colleague. No more bountifully equipped man could have been found in the world for this task. This little primer is comprehensive; no important branch of Assyrian research is left wholly untouched, and none is mentioned without being illuminated. The table of contents shows how wide is its field, and we transcribe it here in full: "The Country and its People;" "The Discovery and Decipherment of the Inscriptions;" "Babylonian and Assyrian History;" "Religion;" "Babylonian and Assyrian Literature;" and "Social Life." After these there is an Appendix, with valuable tables of chronology. The book is disappointingly brief, for the subject is too vast for such narrow limits, and there was room in our literature for a book of about the same size as Kaulen's popular *Assyrien und Babylonien* in German. But within the compass no book in any language on this subject is its equal. We have no hesitation in commending it, without reserve, to all who would know the outlines of this thrillingly interesting science.

Bishop Lightfoot. Reprinted from the *Quarterly Review*, with a Prefatory Note by BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Durham. 8vo. pp. 139. New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

When Joseph Barber Lightfoot left Cambridge to go away to Durham as the bishop of a great diocese there were not a few in Cambridge and

elsewhere who thought that a great waste was about to be made. He was then the greatest patristic scholar in the world. He had already written several of his projected commentaries on the Pauline epistles, and common critical judgment had received them as among the finest specimens of New Testament exegesis. His lecture room was filled with enthusiastic students, and his influence upon the whole university was profound and quickening. Why should such a man be taken away from his books and his desk to bear the sore burdens and anxieties of an Anglican bishop in the north country? So we thought and so we said. But the man who, perhaps, knew him best now writes in the Preface to this choice little book, "I can well believe that, while Dr. Lightfoot loved his college and his university with perfect devotion, the busy episcopate, full of great designs and great achievements, was his happiest time." That is very good news; for, as the loss to Cambridge was so great, we are glad to have this witness that there was a compensation at Durham. There is many another testimony to good and inspiring and cheerful things in this little book. There is to be no biography of Bishop Lightfoot, and there is, therefore, a special need for some brief memoir of his noble life. The paper printed in the *Quarterly Review*, by an unknown writer who evidently stood very near to the bishop at Auckland Castle, is here reprinted with an admirable and thoroughly characteristic portrait. It is introduced by some warm and eloquent words from the pen of the great New Testament scholar who was his friend at Cambridge, his successor at Durham, and is currently reputed to be the author of that noble inscription upon the great bishop's tomb which, for its stately form, its true testimony to greatness, and its comprehensive summary of his life, may well serve as a model: "† IN MEMORIAM JOSEPHI BARBER LIGHTFOOT S. T. P. EPISCOPI DUNELMENSIS NATUS A. D. MDCCCXXVIII. OBIT A. D. MDCCCLXXXIX. QUALIS FUERIT ANTIQUITATIS INVESTIGATOR EVANGELII INTERPRES ECCLESIE RECTOR TESTANTUR OPERA UT ÆQUALIBUS ITA POSTERIS PROFUTURA † AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM. AM. PON. CUR. †" This dainty little volume may be unqualifiedly commended to the "gentle reader" who loves good company in his books.

In Old New York. By THOMAS A. JANVIER, Author of *The Aztec Treasure House*, *The Uncle of an Angel*, etc. Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 285. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$1.75.

The growth of a great city is a matter of more than local interest; and the Harper Brothers recognized this when they included within the pages of their widely circulated magazine the articles which now form this exquisite volume. The book itself it would be difficult to praise too highly. In mechanical appearance it is about as near perfection as any book could well attain. Paper, type, and binding all enhance the intrinsic value of the text and illustrations. The author's style has all the typical French characteristics incorporated in a thoroughly American book. It is clear, direct, and sprightly, with delightful touches of delicate and kindly humor. The author evidently writes *con amore*, and we cannot imagine one of his readers spending a single dull moment over his pages.

The first chapter, of eighty-three pages, is entitled "The Evolution of New York." Here we have an historical and topographical summary of the city's progress up to the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825. Another chapter, "Greenwich Village," describes one of the author's favorite haunts. This village lay on the west side of the present city below the present Christopher Street ferry; but it is now a down-town portion of solidly built-up New York, and the very name has disappeared from the knowledge of most New Yorkers except in connection with a street or two and one or two banking and other institutions. To show how the city has advanced in the last eighty years we quote from the book the following advertisement of a hotel, which appeared in the *Columbian*, September 18, 1811: "A few gentlemen may be accommodated with board and lodging at this pleasant and healthy situation, a few doors from the State Prison [then at the foot of West Tenth Street]. The Greenwich stage passes from this to the Federal Hall and returns five times a day." The book describes many quaint localities and ancient houses now remaining, and contains much curious and valuable information as to old neighborhoods and old manners of life which will be of interest to others besides New Yorkers. The illustrations are excellent, and prove how much essential beauty an artistic eye may find in what, to most of us, appears in the reality only as the commonplace, the squalid, or the positively ugly.

Providential Epochs. By FRANK M. BRISTOL, D.D. 12mo, pp. 269. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

In a modest preface the author informs us that the contents of this book were at first a series of lectures to Christian young people, intended to stimulate and direct them in courses of historical reading. He hopes that the studies to which his book is an incentive may "promote a belief in the Providence of history, a confidence in the world's perpetual advancement, and a growth of pure and lofty patriotism in the hearts of our American youth." All that he thus hopes for Dr. Bristol's book is itself capable of doing, even without the reinforcement of further reading. For the producing of such results a book like this, setting in array the central, salient, and significant events and laying the great lessons clearly down before us, is more immediate, certain, and effective than many-volumed histories. It gives the sweetness from a hundred fields and gives it to us, honey in the comb; a whole summer's labor offered up in one munificent moment. The brief table of contents simply names the epochal great subjects, "The Renaissance," "The Reformation," "The Discovery of America," and "The Settlement of Our Country;" but these together cover a large reach of human history, and each epoch is full of the action of powerful personalities, pregnant with momentous interests, and moving forward to vast issues. Familiar with the riches of historic literature and inspired by a robust assurance that the one supreme thing to be seen in human progress is "God in history," as Bunsen says, the author surveys and marshals facts, happenings, and personages and sketches his brilliant

historic cartoons with manly vigor of handling, with artistic skill, with dramatic force, and in strong colors. The book is a crowded portrait gallery in which we have glimpses of well-nigh all the world-making men that are encountered in recorded history since the upward march of mankind began.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Master and Men; or, *The Sermon on the Mount Practiced on the Plain*. By WILLIAM BURNET WRIGHT. 12mo, pp. 240. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

The author is not a stranger to the reading public, being known by his volume of sermons, *The World to Come*, and his book, *Ancient Cities, from the Dawn to the Daylight*. The present book consists of definitions and exhibits. It defines saintliness, which is only manhood in full bloom, in its various elements as outlined by the Sermon on the Mount, and demonstrates the practicability of saintliness by actual saints. The chapters that are made up of definition and discussion of principles are entitled, "Puzzles," "A Fertile Source of Puzzles," "The Change that Must Come," "Blessedness and Power," "The Blessedness of Sorrow," "The Inheritance of the Meek," "Hunger and Thirst after Righteousness," "Mercy," "Seeing God," and "The Peacemakers." The illustrative saints who are vividly put in evidence are Moses, Socrates, Paul, King Alfred, George Fox, Charles George Gordon, and George Macdonald—each of these in a chapter by himself, like a divine masterpiece, as Raphael's Sistine Madonna in the gallery at Dresden has a chamber all to itself, where visitors sit silent and entranced.

Josiah Wedgwood, F.R.S. His Personal History. By SAMUEL SMILES, Author of *Self-Help*, *Character*, etc. 12mo, pp. 330. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, ornamental, \$1.50.

The Wedgwoods have been numerous for generations in Staffordshire, Yorkshire, Cheshire, Cumberland, and Westmoreland. For the most part they have been a family of potters since 1600. Improvement in certain kinds of earthenware is largely due to the ingenuity and patience and taste of this family, prolonged through generations. Josiah, the most noted of the Wedgwoods, was born in Burslem, Staffordshire, in 1730. He brought a rude and empirical handicraft to the condition of an industrial art. He was a later Palissy, inventing a new chemistry and new tools for his trade. He took the English market away from Holland, France, and Germany, and was appointed potter to the Queen. He raised himself to opulence and distinction, becoming a fellow of the Royal Society and of the Antiquarian Society. Yet his life was a struggle with physical suffering. In 1892, when he had been dead a hundred years, one of his copies of the famous Barberini or Portland vase sold for over one thousand dollars. This book is a stimulating story of the victorious career of a self-made man, who in his hard-won triumph made his wealth a blessing to his fellow-men.

Illustrative Notes. A Guide to the Study of the Sunday School Lessons, with Original and Selected Comments, Methods of Teaching, Illustrative Stories, Practical Applications, Notes on Eastern Life, Library References, Maps, Tables, Pictures, Diagrams. By JESSE LYMAN HURLBUT and ROBERT REMINGTON DOHERTY. Large 8vo, pp. 365. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

The high commendations which we aimed to make of this publication in 1894 and previously might be repeated for 1895. It would be difficult to suggest any detail of help for the Sunday school teacher and advanced scholar which is here omitted. In lesson comments, illustrations, attractive print, and other matters the volume is most superior. For what it intrinsically is we commend it most cordially to the notice of all sincere Bible students in our Sunday schools.

Things of the Mind. By J. L. SPALDING, Bishop of Peoria. 12mo, pp. 235. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.

The chapters on education are in the aphoristic style of Emerson and are as painfully devoid of coherence. But the aphorisms are good and may be useful to the order of mind Emerson inspired. Now and then the essayist stoops to become forcible, as in the following: "That which still survives as literature is what a few heavenly minds have picked up from beneath the hoofs of the herd, whose uplifted snouts pleaded for swill, not for thought." The chapters on "Professional Education" and "Culture and Religion" have a more definite value. The latter is an especially strong and clear discussion of the place of culture in human society. The author's criticism of Renan and Matthew Arnold is masterly, and the whole essay is a piece of thoughtfulness, good temper, and excellent style.

A Treasury of Stories, Jingles, and Rhymes. With One Hundred and Forty Vignette Illustrations in Half Tone after MAUD HUMPHREY. Short Stories; Fairy Tales; Mother Goose Jingles; Verses. By EDITH M. THOMAS, ELIZABETH S. TUCKER, and HELEN GRAY CONE. 8vo, pp. 251. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. Price, cloth, \$1.75.

From the standpoint of childhood this book is a "treasury" to be prized. The only defect which might be pointed out, if it be such, is the surplus of verse over prose. In illustration and general attraction the book ranks among the worthy holiday issues of the year.

Hypatia; or, New Foes with an Old Face. By CHARLES KINGSLEY. Illustrations and portrait of the author. Two volumes. 8vo, pp. 773. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, silk, ornamental, gilt tops, \$7.

One of the most elegant products of the book-making art—Charles Kingsley's historic masterpiece in a silk dress, adorned as a bride for her lord. In this radiant book the hand of genius pictures the struggle between old paganism and Christianity in the early ages of the faith. In this day of the comparison of religions *Hypatia* makes for confidence in the superiority of our holy religion.

The Potter's Thumb. By FLORA ANNIE STEEL. 12mo, pp. 351. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

Richard Henry Stoddard says of this book, "It has given me a clearer insight of native life in India, its subtleties, its sinuosities, its superstitions, than I have obtained from the Anglo-Indian tales of Mr. Kipling, who writes from without, while Mrs. Steel writes from within."

